THE
ROAD TO COMMUNISM

VOL. 1, No. 1 MAY – JULY 1934

PRICE - THIRTY FIVE CENTS

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST OPPOSITION

NEW YORK OFFICE

COMMUNIST PARTY U. S. A. (OPPOSITION)

51 WEST 14th ST., N. Y.

557

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Page

The International Communist Opposition 2

The Prague Program of the German Social Democracy
A Critique 7

The York Conference of the Independent Labor Party
of England 16

The Thirteenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of
the Communist International 22

What Next for the Communist Movement in Czechoslovakia? . 29

The Class War in Austria 38

To the Communist Party U.S.A. (Opposition)
Letter from the First Underground National
Convention of the Communist Party of
Germany (Opposition) 48

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST OPPOSITION

The victories of the Fascist dictatorship in Germany and Austria have caused a great upheaval in the rank and file of the working class movement. These are the heaviest blows that the international working class has experienced since 1914. The German working class movement, which was one of the strongest in the capitalist countries, was organized decades ago under difficulties which called for courageous action. In Austria the working class had achieved a very high degree of organization. All this collapsed under the blows of fascism without a battle and in a few moments in Germany and after courageous but brief resistance in Austria. The world proletariat has been hit a heavy blow through the loss of the organized strength of the German and Austrian working classes. This blow has lent new courage to the international bourgeoisie. The international proletariat, therefore, feels itself weakened.

But that is not all, the victory of the Fascist dictatorships in Germany and Austria makes it clear that Fascism is a typical expression of the decay of capitalism. In the victory of Fascism in Italy and Poland large sections of the working class deceived themselves in thinking that it was merely a specific manifestation among the less industrially developed countries. Germany, however, is one of the most highly developed capitalist countries.

Fascist tendencies varied in their expression in the different capitalist countries—— the tempo of development depending on the economic and political condition in the different countries. But the tempo and variation are at most of secondary and tertiary significance. The trend toward facism is general. This is the first and permanent lesson of the German and Austrian events for the international working class. That is why the consequences of these events will have to be heeded by the working class in general. These experiences are of great significance for every capitalist country and for the entire international working class movement.

To estimate properly these consequences, one must understand the general causes of the defeat. The defeat in Germany came altogether unexpectedly to the Second and Third Internationals. They had orientated themselves toward an altogether different perspective. The Second International had hoped for the decay of Fascism through the conflict of forces within the Capitalist class in Germany and Austria. The Third International announced, up to the very moment of the

Fascist victory in Germany, and even after, that the revolutionary upsurge of the working class was on. In Austria the Communist International played no significant role. It follows that in neither case was the characteristic form of Fascism really recognized. The only factor in the international working class movement which saw these events clearly was the International Communist Opposition, but its criticism, its proposals for the campaign of defense were rejected.

Still it would be wrong to attach the same sort of blame to the Second and Third Internationals, that is, reformism and communism, for the defeats. The character of their respective guilt is essentially different. In Germany reformist policies, in their entirety and their principles, were practically tested and refuted by facts. Fascism triumphed over the bourgeois republic. The content and principles of reformism, however, was bourgeois democracy. The fourteen-year-old Weimar Republic in Germany represented the thoroughly developed and fully executed experiment for the realization of the reformist program. The destruction of the Weimar Republic, through Fascism, is the practical refutation of reformism on a grand scale in one of the most highly developed capitalist countries. Austro-Marxism, with its much-heralded Red Vienna, the "left" of the Second International, also collapsed in the face of the Fascist onslaught. Here the reformists had the field all clear to themselves. There was practically no communist opposition to them. The Fascists, on the contrary, were divided. Yet, in this ideal test of the principles of reformism, Social-Democracy proved, beyond the slightest doubt, its failure, its total and dangerous uselessness as a philosophy of working class liberation.

The refutation of reformism, herein presented, is at the same time the proof of the correctness of communist principles for Central and Western Europe. At present, of course, this is a negative proof, for Communism has not yet succeeded in Germany. It has not as yet been backed by the majority of the workers, and Communism can be victorious only if it is supported by the great majority of the workers. The Communist Party of Germany could not win this majority, and the Communist Party of Austria could not win even a firm foothold among the masses, despite correct principles and favorable objective conditions. This tragic state is due primarily to the tactical errors, that is to the errors in the application of these principles to the special class relations in Germany and Austria. Here, and here only, lies the weakeness(and also the guilt) of the Communist movement as it appeared in Germany and Austria.

But this manifestation is not restricted to German Communism alone. It is a historical weakness of the C.I. As against the successes of communism in the S .U. stand the numerous failures in the other countries. The application of communist principles outside the S.U. does not rank as high as the application within the S.U.

The Communist Party of the S.U., however, is today not only the leading but the sole determining party of the C.I. In this latter function lies the harm. The CP of S.U does not suffice for the general task of leading the struggle for the victory of the proletarian revolution all over the world. As a matter of fact, no single communist party could be adequate for this enormous task. It is now a matter of bringing the communist parties of the countries outside the S.U. up to the level of their historical tasks. They must be made mature.

The chief point, now, is to replace the leadership monopoly of the CP of the S.U., which has become an obstacle to its development, by a collective, international leadership of the communist world movement, not less united or less firm, but more correct and more effective. In order to obtain this result a struggle based on communism is necessary. This struggle must be organized. The IC-O is the organ of this struggle. The events in Germany and Austria facilitate and hasten the fulfillment of its task. The false tactics of the CI outside the S.U. have undergone decisive criticisms especially through the German events, and were refuted by the facts.

Defeats are good lessons, at least for the class and the party that represent the society of the future. As for reformism, the general task of the working class today consists of carrying out the judgment pronounced by the German and Austrian events, to bury it. The victory of the working class over the classical political form of decaying capitalism, over fascism, is dependent on the complete destruction of reformism. Fascism is that form of capitalism resting on the broadest and most brutal violence. Only the revolutionary force of the working class(united on the basis of communism and on the common ground of realizing union with all other laboring classes) can completely and for all times defeat the enemy.

Reformism, however, will not abdicate voluntarily. As the Paris conference of the Second International has shown, reformists make complicated manoeuvres in order to hold their ground against communism. They assume a "left" coloring. Beaten and suppressed by fascism, reformism now waves the banner of bourgeois-democratic revolution. While still in battle against fascism, it already prepares its future counter-revolutionary role which is opposed to the proletarian revolution. Communism must conquer reformism by means of planned action. Communism can be victorious only if it liberates itself completely from its tactical mistakes and weaknesses which hinder it from checking to any considerable degree the influence of reformism on the working class.

The bankruptcy of reformist policies and the tactical mistakes of the CI have led to a temporary revival of left Social Democratic Centrist views, according to which, concluding from the events in Germany, a new international and a new revolutionary party must be founded. The basis of these views is the attempt to unite the standpoints of bourgeois democracy and proletarian dictatorship, which exclude each other; and in doing so, to leave the proletarian dictatorship as a mere phrase and to retain

bourgeois democracy as the base. This is evidently a variety of reformism trying to adjust itself to the fact that numerous reformist workers have begun to despair of bourgeois democracy, but do not as yet fully comprehend the proletarian dictatorship while, on the other hand, a section of the erstwhile communist workers have faltered or become passive under the blows of fascism. In the years 1918-21 Kautsky, Hilferding and Otto Bauer supplied the theory for this conception. Its typical expression was Austro-Marxism. But these theories, too, have in the meantime become discredited. The present theory of centrism is being supplied by Trotzykism. Centrism is the last entrenchment of reformism. In order to destroy completely reformism, the annihilation of centrism is absolutely necessary. Methods used in the struggle against open reformism and centrism must vary according to the nature of the object fought. The goal in either case must be the same; namely, to lead the proletarian elements politically organized to communism. To be sure, not to a "true" communism, to be thought out in the future, but to the given historically real communism of existing communist parties and tendencies.

The victory of the fascist dictatorship has strengthened the will of the working class towards united action regardless of party affiliations. The unity of proletarian action against fascism and the war danger is a practical necessity. As long as the majority of the working class does not yet accept communist principles, the comprehensive and correct application of united front tactics is indispensable. The tactics of the united front are not contrary to the goal of winning the majority of the working class for communism. On the contrary, it is at the same time a means through which to convince the working class of the superiority of communism during the struggle itself. Communism can win the working class only if the theoritical propaganda is supplemented and confirmed by the practical phase of the struggle.

The international labor movement, as a result of the German and Austrian events , is confronted with the great and difficult task of overcoming its "half-heartedness , weaknesses and wretchedness." The serious menace of Fascism in France is another alarm signal. These tasks consist of the complete destruction of reformism, the complete overcoming of the tactical errors of the parties of the CI, the positive working out of revolutionary tactics and strategy necessary for the victory of the proletarian revolution in the developed capitalist countries, above all in Germany, which today, next to the Soviet Union, is the focus of the international proletarian class struggle. Socialist construction in the S.U., the preparation for the victory of the proletarian revolution in Germany and Austria, while combating the fascist distatorship, the struggle for the defeat of fascism in France, the fight against the growing menace of imperialist war, these are today the most important issues of the struggle of the international working class.

The central organ of the IC-C, the "Road to Communism" is dedicated to the clarification and solution of these problems. The fulfillment of these aims goes hand in hand with the restoration of the organizational unity of the communist world movement on the basis of better and more mature communist tactics. In other words, our aim is to make the communist parties of the capitalist countries and, thereby, the working class as a whole, capable of a more successful application of communist principles, an application better suited to the conditions of the struggle in each country, i.e. to make it capable of victory.

The Prague Program of the German Social-Democracy

In the Prague "Neue Vorwaerts" of January 28th of this year the Executive Committee of the "Social-Democratic Party of Germany" published a document entitled "The Fight and Aim of Revolutionary Socialism, the Policy of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany." It is the new program of the German Social-Democracy to the extent that the latter is embodied in the party executive committee in Prague.

The occasion for this proclamation was ostensibly the conclusion of the first year of the fascist dictatorship. The real reason was, however, quite different; it was the drifting away of a section of the social-democratic workers toward communism. The new program is intended to bring this defection to a halt, and with this end in view, the old social-democratic stew is warmed over and served in another form. While the old social-democratic content is retained in the Prague program, its form is altered for the benefit of the left tendencies in the remnants of the Socialist Party of Germany. The Prague program is thus a model piece of hypocrisy, duplicity and confusion. A reading of the document reveals that we are confronted with a revised form of centrism. The document is further characterized by numerous adaptations of fascist ideology. It is clear that a document such as this, intended to appeal to those elements in the Socialist Party of Germany which are gravitating toward communism, to those under fascist influences and to the various bourgeois oppositionist elements with whom social-democracy would like to play a new form of coalition politics, is bound to be full of contradictions.

We must at this time limit ourselves to a criticism of the most important points of the program. The bourgeois-democratic stamp is already apparent in the pathetic preamble. Fascist serfdom is to be overthrown by the "right to liberty" and "lawlessness" by "socialist order".

The "right to liberty" is the usual vulgar democratic rhetoric. Unless the application of the phrase is limited to the working class it means "liberty" for the exploiters. Behind the fine sounding phrase of "Lawlessness shall be replaced by socialist order" is crafty deceit. "Lawlessness" is a political concept, socialist order an economic one. "Lawlessness" is a vague expression for dictatorship. Lenin correctly defined dictatorship as extra-legal power. The dictatorship over the exploiting class is thus rejected, the ambiguous expression "socialist order" replaces "bourgeois democracy", i.e., the foregoing of dictatorial power over the exploiting classes. Why was not this stated openly? In order to mislead the workers to whom the bankruptcy of bourgeois democracy is apparent. It is no accident that "socialist order" is the slogan also of the French neo-socialists.

In the introduction, reformism and legality are likewise seemingly repudiated in words:

> "In the struggle against the National-Socialist Dictatorship there is no compromise, there is no room for reformism and legality."

The content of the program reduces these words into mere rhetoric. If they had been said in earnest, however, they would have expressed ultra-left stupidity. For, of course, the revolutionary working class in the fight against fascism cannot forego compromise with the other sections of the working class which are also fighting Fascism. Obviously, the working class cannot forego partial

demands or to make full use in the revolutionary struggles of every legal weapon. Exaggerations, such as these, result when bombastic revolutionary phrases are thrown around to conceal reformist meaning.

The actual tactical policy of the Prague program consists of the rejection of partial struggles, that is, of the only real preparation for the struggle for power. The "revolutionary elite" (an expression borrowed from the Communist vocabulary) is given the task of striking when ".....spontaneous mass action has begun". Preparation of the mass action evidently is not the task of the "revolutionary elite" of Prague. Such preparation, however, is decisive. In fact, at this time it is the essence of genuine revolutionary activity.

When mass action has commenced, we read, the "revolutionary organization" should be "expanded" into a mass organization. This instruction shows the Prague gentry have not the slightest conception of concrete revolutionary action (hardly surprising in incorrigible reformists). Revolutionary mass organizations in the first place can arise only through such mass action as shake the foundations of Fascism. Secondly, it is necessary to tell the workers what sort of organizations are to be the organs of struggle when the stage of mass revolt is reached. The correct answer is workers councils. It is easy to understand why the Prague program did not think of them. Then the way to workers councils must be shown--i.e., united front organizations!

The Party Executive Committee of Prague thus is waiting until the "spontaneous" mass action begins. It has nothing, or only distortions, to say about what is to be done when the mass action does begin, for it rejects struggles for partial demands and offers bourgeois democratic slogans in their stead.

Pompously the Prague gentlemen declare:

> "Support and advancement will go to each group whose revolutionary spirit assures the devotion of its energies to the overthrow of the National-Socialist dictatorship" in the bounds of the solidarity of the working class."

What does "in the bounds of the solidarity of the working class" mean?

What is meant of course is the exclusion of Communists from support by the Prague gentlemen. This hypocritical phrase, however, suggests a turn which seems to oppose the support of anti-fascist organizations outside of the working class. A real revolutionary policy obviously demands the support of all forces which fight against fascism, (on the basis of the revolutionary aim of the working class), that is, the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship. This condition is all-important. The actual policy of the Socialist Party of Germany consists of cooperation with bourgeois anti-fascist forces on the basis of bourgeois democracy and the retention of capitalism.

II

In order to placate the "left" tendencies in the party, the Prague program of the Socialist Party of Germany makes a hypocritical double-meaning and insincere acknowledgement of its sins in the past.

> "The political upheaval of 1918 was the culmination of a counter-revolutionary development."

(Borrowed from the Socialist Workers Party (SAP) vocabulary), a shameful and lying statement of Social-Democracy betrayal of socialism, its desertion to the imperialist camp during the war. Wherein lies the deception? The subjective betrayal of the Socialist Party of Germany is hammered and falsified into an objective factor. The

World War, however, objectively created a revolutionary situation while the betrayal and the counter-revolution is credited to the subjective account of Social-Democracy. It is further stated:

> "In taking over, almost unaltered, the old state apparatus the German labor movement (!) which was disorientated (!) during the War, committed a serious historical mistake."

Another new word on another new subterfuge. The "labor movement" is substituted for "Social-Democracy" and it is made to appear that the "disorientation" came by itself, while in reality it resulted from the fact that Social-Democracy entered the service of imperialism and deliberately used its party machinery to "disorientate" the working class.

"The new situation" was then made secure "and excludes all repetition".

The contradiction follows immediately for the new program of the "exercise of power" which is now developing, is a repetition of the old in new forms.

After the overthrow of fascism a "strong, revolutionary government.....supported and controlled by the revolutionary mass party of the working class" will be formed.

What sort of government will be this government "supported" and controlled by the "revolutionary mass party of the working class"? To fit the definition it does not need to be even that; it could be a coalition of the Socialist Party of Germany and the bourgeois democratic parties. The words are carefully chosen. The program avoids saying that the government will be <u>formed</u> by the "revolutionary mass party", stating that the government will be <u>supported</u> by the party.

What, further, are to be the <u>organs</u> of this state power? Not a word is said about councils which as proletarian class organs, would exercise the power of state.

There are only two kinds of state apparatus, the bourgeois variety, whose organ is the bourgeois bureaucracy and the proletarian kind whose organs are the councils. The rejection of the councils means the retention of the bourgeois state apparatus. There are no other kinds. The social-democratic, or social-democrat bourgeois coalition, government thus would take over the old bourgeois state apparatus in the form in which it emerges from the ruins of the fascist regime. Such a state apparatus would not be the ordinary bourgeois sort but a very definite kind, a fascist machinery of state.

The assumption of power would consist of the replacement of the fascist <u>heads</u> of this apparatus by Social-Democrats and bourgeois democrats.

The fascist state apparatus would not be destroyed and abolished, it would merely be "cleansed". The bourgeois fascist base <u>would remain</u>.

The cleansing would be accomplished as follows: "Revolutionary tribunals", (words taken from the Spartacus program), for trying fascist offenders against the state, would be established. And now we come to something very characteristic of the type of "revolutionists" which drew up the program--the fascist leaders are to be tried for "<u>violation of the constitution</u>". What constitution have the fascists violated? The <u>Weimar Constitution</u>? We must now choose between two alternatives. We are either to form a government which itself is rebelling against the Weimar Constitution, in which case it could not punish violations of the Constitution or, if it does punish such offenses, the government is to be the continuer or restorer of the Weimar republic. "Revolutionary tribunals"--on a Weimar basis!

In the revolutionary lion skin we discover a little bourgeois-democratic jackass.

The judges of the tribunal are to be removable, a revolutionary novelty which has been realized long ago in any number of bourgeois-democratic states. Vacancies are to be filled by "trusted servants of the revolutionary government." And who are to be these "Trusted servants"? No objective class designation is offered; it suffices that they have the trust of the Social-Democratic government. Did not the Prussian generals have the trust of Ebert, Scheidermann, and Noske before and after the Kapp Putsch? Why not proletarian courts composed exclusively of proletarians? Even the basic features of the bourgeois court system are to be retained.

"Organization of reliable military and police forces."

"Complete reorganization of the officer corps."

Again, no class distinctions! There is not to be arming of the workers and disarming of the bourgeoisie. The army and the police force are simply to be loyal to the government and their class composition is to remain the same. We know, of course, that the Socialist Party of Germany bureaucrats have their eyes on army appointments. Hence, the caution.

"Equal rights of citizenship without distinction of race or creed."

Above all without distinction of class! The exploiting classes which had financed, and placed and kept in power the fascist bandits would thus receive as their reward from Social-Democracy the return of their "equal rights of citizenship", i.e., they will be able immediately after the overthrow of fascism to begin anew to organize the counter-revolution!

There is however to be a "suppression of all counter-revolutionary agitation". These are only words when the capitalist class is left with the right to organize itself, to control a press, etc.

The "revolutionary government" would then carry out a number of allegedly revolutionizing measures on the economic field, and then the bourgeois democracy would be restored openly in all its aspects. (The provisional "revolutionary government" would be a disguised bourgeois-democratic regime).

Next would come a "national assembly elected by universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage in separate electoral districts."

The national assembly would elect the "chief" of the national government who in turn would appoint the ministers. In the municipalities, alongside the bureaucracy, there would be "self-government" bodies to which, evidently, the exploiting class would also be admitted.

What is all this? It is a degenerated form of the policy of the Independent Socialists, Haase, et al, in 1918-19. The Independents were noted principally for the calling of the National Assembly; their policy differed from that of the Socialist Party of Germany only in that they called the assembly at a later period than the S. P. G.'s plan would call it. They also conceived the famous theory of the "anchoring" of the councils in the (bourgeois-democratic) constitution. The only difference between the Social-Democratic proposal and that of the Independents is that the latter merely helped to throttle the councils, i.e., proletarian class organs, whereas that of the Socialist Party of Germany would eliminate councils from the very beginning. It is clear that a "revolutionary" regime which assists in the restoration of an openly bourgeois democracy must, from the very outset be the rallying point of the bourgeois counter-revolution against the forces of the proletarian revolution.

The "progress" of the Prague gentry amounts to this, that in the place of the policy of Ebert, Scheidemann and Noske which set up Haase, Barth and Hilferding, in the place of the open reformism, they would establish a disguised reformism, namely, centrism.

And the Prague Social-Democrats thus betray a truly counter-revolutionary instinct. The bourgeois state and capitalist economy can no longer be saved by the methods of 1918. New means must be found and centrism offers the solution.

The economic measures of the "revolutionary" government follow the same line described above.

III

What does the "Socialist" program of the Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of Germany consist of?

The most important points are the following:

1. Uncompensated expropriation of the large land holdings: transformation of large scale agriculture into co-operative enterprises of the farm workers, aided by the government funds.
2. Uncompensated expropriation of heavy industry
3. Socialization of the large banks on a national scale
4. Establishment of a "supreme socialist planning body" which will supervise the "preparation for the socialization of the economic units still remaining in capitalist control", and which will be charged with the task of "setting up an administrative organization for the nationalization of the economic units with the cooperation of the producers and consumers."

The "Socialization" then is to be extended to the credit system, the insurance organizations, heavy industry, the chemical industry, the manufacturing industries, transport, and power production.

The "socialization commission" of 1918-20 rises in triumph from the grave!

Is any real socialization involved in the above? Of course not! The basic prerequisites of genuine socialization are, (1) that the power of state be in the hands of the working class (2) that national economy be directed by working class organs, (the machinery of the workers' state, trade unions, factory councils, etc.,) (3) that the capitalist class not only be expropriated by the state without compensation but also be completely removed from the direction or control of the national economy.

What is proposed in the plan?

1. As we have shown in a previous article the "revolutionary government" proposed in the Prague program is not a workers' government but a disguised social-democratic revival of the bourgeois-democratic state, of the Weimar Republic, it is the "cleansed" fascist apparatus of state, with social-democrats at its head. This "revolutionary" government in reality is a bourgeois government. Without workers' councils and proletarian class organs there can be no proletarian state.

2. Nowhere in the plan is it stated that only proletarian organs are to direct the state. What, therefore, is the mysterious "administrative organization" which is to provide economic guidance and is to set up the supreme socialist planning body? Obviously a bureaucratic machinery composed of bourgeois officials, capitalists, ("producers"), and in addition a few workers who are to have the honor of being instructed by bourgeois officials and capitalists in how socialist economy is constructed and conducted. The workers would constitute the fifth wheel on the wagon and the actual directors would be the bureau-

crats and the capitalists.

3. The capitalists thus would in fact retain control over the enterprises. A portion of the capitalists would not be expropriated, namely, those who own the key industries.

4. The peasant enterprises would remain unchanged, since nothing is said about helping them along the road to collectivization.

What, therefore, is involved in this so-called "socialization" program. Not socialism, certainly, but state capitalism! The bourgeois-democratic state, in the social-democratic cloak would take over the "key industries" and the large banking institutions. The capitalist character of the economy would remain unaltered. Capitalist economy would merely be rearranged on a state capitalistic pattern. That, however, is the necessary condition--and here the Prague social-democrats betray a true instinct--for, the retention and the entrenchment of the capitalist system after the revolutionary overthrow of the fascist dictatorship.

For this are required:

1. Pseudo-socialist measures, and, above all, phrases as in 1918-19 ("Socialism is on the march" etc.).

2. The concentration of monopoly capital in the hands of the bourgeois state. The intervention of the state in capitalist economy in the interest of the latter's retention, strengthening and regulation, already expanded under the fascist dictatorship, will be continued and further increased. The Prague program concerns itself not with the first stage of socialism but with the last stage of monopoly capitalism, that in which monopoly capital is consolidated in the control of the state. Consolidated for what purpose? For the intensified subjection of all other classes and social strata to the rule of monopoly capital. In this connection it is less important that the expropriation of the capitalists proceeds only in stages than that such expropriation rebounds to the benefit of the bourgeois state power and that the capitalists as before retain the control of the enterprises, whether openly and directly as in the capitalist sector, or covertly and indirectly as in the "consolidated" (in reality state capitalist), sector, where the capitalists as officials of the planning commission in the roles of "producers" and (industrial) consumers exercise executive power.

The Prague program offers advance indications of the form and direction in which the counter-revolutionary capabilities of the social democrats will express themselves.

Further on the political field. Workers' councils, which will assume the leadership of the armed uprising, and which will have the task of converting organs of revolt into organs of the proletarian state, will, of course, be formed as soon as the revolutionary mass action reaches a certain scope and stage and the fascist dictatorship is crushed. The role of Social-Democracy will, therefore, consist of hindering the formation of the councils; when in spite of it the councils have been established, of transforming them into props of the bourgeois-democratic state and into organs of collaboration with the bourgeois-democratic state and into organs of collaboration with the bourgeoisie; of rendering them impotent; and finally, in the interest of the "national assembly", of entirely eliminating them.

Similarly on the economic field. To enable the proletarian state to expropriate the capitalists and to take over the management of the enterprises it is necessary that the fight of the working class, in all its scope, be directed toward the winning of control over every single enterprise. The struggle in other words for workers' control of production, is imperative. Socialization cannot be the result of bureaucratic measures; it can only be the culmination

of the concerted mass action of the workers and other employees in every capitalist enterprise. Social-Democracy will oppose real socialization and be in favor of "regulated" bureaucratic-capitalist conduct of industry. Already today Social-Democracy is sabotaging the building of a basis and of initial steps for the fight of the working class for the control of capitalist undertakings. It sabotages the organization of illegal class unions composed of trusted people (key men) in the various enterprises, etc.

The Prague program of Social-Democracy thus would make itself felt not only in the actual struggle for power but in the preparation for the conflict as well.

Already today it has a counter-revolutionary effect on the coming proletarian revolution.

One must not underestimate the effect of this program merely because Social-Democracy has been more or less shattered by fascism. Social-Democracy is not yet destroyed. This seemingly socialist, but actually state-capitalist and bourgeois-democratic program, will even today serve as a rallying point for bourgeois anti-fascist elements and on the fall of the fascist dictatorship it will be the rallying point for all counter-revolutionary forces. For, we repeat, the program has for its aim the rescue of capitalist economy and the bourgeois state which is possible only under the conditions we have described.

If today the bourgeois-democratic Georg Bernhard can understand that this rescue is no longer possible without recourse to which appear to be socialist phrases, then, in due time the entire capitalist class with its infallible class instinct will also understand.

To the social-democratic worker, however, the capitalist class character and the counter-revolutionary content of the Prague program must be exposed in the sharpest and consistent manner.

IV

The line on foreign policy laid down in Social-Democracy's Prague program is a mixture of social patriotism in favor of democratic imperialism (France, England) which will afford those governments a catchword with which to mislead the masses in the next imperialist war, of Platonic protests against war and double-meaning anti-militaristic phrases.

The program advocates "equal rights for the democracies but no arms for war-craving dictatorships". What are the "equal rights for democracies" which would be denied "war-craving dictatorships"? "Equal rights" to what? Obviously, to armaments. What is this but approval of the arming of democracies against Hitler Germany, of preparation for imperialist war against Fascism in the name of "democracy"?

With matchless hypocrisy the program continues:

> "Not a single man, not a single penny for this system, that is the slogan of German Democracy, that must be the slogan of the Social-Democratic Workers' International".

What should be the international slogan of the Social-Democratic Party? Not a man and not a penny for the fascist system? The Social-Democrats of France, England, etc. these have only to decide whether or not they shall give their "democratic system" "a single man and a single penny!" And the Prague Social-Democrats do not have any objections to such donations, but they pretend that they do.

And what about the Soviet Union? According to Social-Democratic standards it certainly is no "democracy". Is it, therefore, to be deprived of "equal rights" to arm? The program does not say yes

openly, that would be a bit too raw for the German Social-Democratic workers but such an answer follows logically from the position of the program.

The program is closed with another entirely hypocritical sermon on "unity of revolutionary socialism". The expression itself is a brand-mark. "Revolutionary Socialism" is a typical centrist phrase which embodies the silent rejection of Communism but which at the same time seeks to avoid the appearance of reformism.

Unity of "revolutionary Socialism" on what basis? The program answers with the resounding phrase: "Complete revolution," is taken from the fascist vocabulary. The phrase sounds terribly "revolutionary". What is its meaning? It has a double one, 1. the rejection of partial struggles, the only road to revolutionary mass action, 2. the evasion of the pivotal question of the class character of the revolution, i.e., whether it is a bourgeois or a proletarian revolution. As a matter of fact, the Prague program embodies the bourgeois revolution, the restoration of the bourgeois-democratic republic (under a Social-Democratic mask) and the rejection of the proletarian dictatorship and the council state. The phrase "total revolution" is intended to conceal all this.

The program continues in the same vein:

> "Differences in the labor movement will be liquidated by the enemy himself. The basis for splits will be destroyed. The struggle for the overthrow of the dictatorship can be conducted only along revolutionary lines.....The unification of the working class will come about through the pressure that history itself imposes."

What a crude ideological distortion!

That the fascist dictatorship can be overthrown only by forcible means is understood by the most stupid bourgeois democrat. Substitute revolutionary for the word forcible, add "socialist", it does not cost anything, and every bourgeois democrat will recognize the phrase a s indispensible for misleading the workers.

All this is crude deceit and a brazen misuse of the instinctive movement of the German working class toward unity on a genuine revolutionary basis. The unity which the fascist dictatorship destroys and which the proletarian dictatorship builds up can only be unity on a communist foundation. Thus far unfortunately this does not yet exist. What can and should be attained is united, joint action of Social-Democratic and Communist workers for partial aims and immediate demands. This form of proletarian unity in action and preparation for action, which is possible today, is rejected by the Prague Social-Democrats.

The kind of unity which the Prague Social-Democrats desire is to be seen from the following further decisions:

1. Support is pledged to the "illegal work of all groups who are engaged in fighting against the dictatorship and not against other working class parties. This is directed at the Communists who are to refrain from fighting reformism. It is implied that Social-Democracy does not fight against Communism.

What does this boil down to? A proposal for unity on a reformist and anti-Communist basis.

2. The Prague people favor discussion but oppose "tearing one another to pieces" over the question of what to do with the as yet unwon victory, the struggle which perpetuates the split in the working class which is the most trusty ally of the dictatorship."

That is roughly what Georg Bernhard also says. Why quarrel over bourgeois democracy or proletarian dictatorship, socialism or capitalism, over the question of what will follow the victory over the fascist dictatorship, when this victory is yet to be won?

Why then, the workers might ask the Prague Social-Democrats, do you now draw up a program for the working class to follow after the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship? If this question is not important at this time, why don't you do without such a program and concern yourselves only with the problem of how the fascist dictatorship may be overthrown leaving the other question to be solved after the victory? Have you not drawn up your program in order to win for it the support of the workers? Of course you have and you thereby refute your own argument. You, by your own example, admit that it is of the greatest importance to tell the working class today what aims to set for its revolutionary action, what to put in the place of the fascist dictatorship.

For upon this depends not only what will happen after the fall of the fascist dictatorship but also the organization of the struggle for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship. If we are to restore bourgeois democracy and retain capitalist economy (with new labels, of course), if we, in other words, are to have bourgeois class aims, it will mean that the working class once more is to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the bourgeoisie and should, therefore, place itself under bourgeois leadership (in the form of Social-Democracy). For these aims, however, the working class cannot be sent into the battle. The tremendous effort necessary for the overthrow of fascism can be mustered only by a working class which is fighting for its own revolutionary class aims. If the Prague Social-Democrats were to come forward openly with bourgeois class aims the working class would have no more to do with them. They, therefore, conceal their aims. The problem of the bourgeoisie, from a long range viewpoint, is thus to mobilize the working class against the fascist dictatorship (against which the bourgeoisie itself is powerless) but, at the same time, to keep the working class under bourgeois command and within the bounds of the bourgeois order. The problem can be solved only through the deception of the working class as to the goal of the struggle, through the deliberate concealment of these aims with ambiguity and double-meaning phrases. Propaganda for a bourgeois program in "socialistic" and "revolutionary" clothing is spread in the ranks of the working class while the opposing Communist propaganda is denounced as a means of "splitting" of the working class. On the day after the victory "we shall see".....This means that amidst the discord engineered during the discussion the bourgeoisie under Social-Democratic leadership will seize the reins. The old play of the swindling of the working class with the aid of the bourgeoisie will be reenacted.

The effect of the failure to settle the problem of what to do after the overthrow of fascism is felt before the victory is won. The results can be seen today in the sabotaging and soft-pedalling of the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie, in the sabotaging of the preparation through partial struggles, of the organization of illegal unions, etc.

In contrast to the fascist counter-revolution which is based on the deception of the masses by a small minority of organized bandits, the proletarian revolution can win only through the complete enlightenment of the masses as to their class interests and revolutionary aims.

The appeal for the "unity of revolutionary socialism" is a crafty deception of the working class in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

The retreat of the Prague Social-Democrats to a centrist position is moreover, intended also to win the Socialist Workers Party, the Trotskyites, etc., back to the Social-Democratic fold.

In fact, the differences between the Social-Democrats and the centrist elements are unimportant. It is not surprising, therefore, when the Menshevik Schifrin in "Zeitschrift Fur Sozialismus", No. 4, speaking of Trotzky and the Trotzkyites declares:

"The disputants have a common basis which bourgeois democracy conceals with "revolutionary" and "Socialistic" phrases.

The York Conference of the I.L.P.

by
Evelyn Lawrence

One hundred and fifty-four delegates from all sections of the country convened at York for the 1934 conference of the Independent Labour Party -- all set for a fight. After four days of deliberations the ILP still remains with an uncertain policy, still contains all tendencies in the working class movement, from the open reformist elements to revolutionaries - and on the whole seems to take pride in this fact.

Several definite tendencies were obviously determined to win the ILP to their respective positions : the reformists pure and simple, led by the "Unity Committee" of which the Lancashire Divisional Council is the driving force; the "Affiliation Committee" which desires immediate affiliation to the Communist International and has no criticism of it; the revolutionaries led by the "Revolutionary Policy Committee" which is in agreement with the principles of the Communist International but is critical of it, and which has been the driving force in the attempt to develop the revolutionary wing of the ILP and to transform the ILP into a revolutionary party; the fourth internationalists who together with the extreme right are violently anti-Communist party and anti- Communist International and are opposed to any united fronts with them; and the centrists, led by the majority of the National Administrative Council, who have gone as far as to say that parliamentary action alone will not win the day, but beyond that are unwilling to meet the issues. They seem to seek schemes to keep everybody in the Party happy, by opposing all clear and positive expressions of policy, and somehow finding a position in between. They criticize Austro Marxists, but their conception of the final struggle is -- a defensive struggle, if any.

It must be added that aside from these very definite tendencies, there is a large section which apparently is anxious to be shown the correct revolutionary path, but as yet seems incapable of distinguishing and evaluating various positions. It is particularly unfortunate for the development of this section that the CI and the CPGB have combined their just criticisms with lack of understanding, lack of tact, and a refusal to answer justified questions and doubts, in such a manner as to confuse the fundamental issues and to make it more difficult for the revolutionary position to drive forward in the ILP.

The Party policy may be determined thru an examination of the fate of a series of disconnected resolutions which composed the section in the agenda on Party Policy. The resolution introduced by the London Divisional Council together with several London branches, which declared that the capture of power by the workers will not depend on and can not be secured by winning a majority in Parliament and aimed to direct the activities of the ILP towards building workers

Councils through daily struggles, to be used for the attainment of power and the foundation of the dictatorship of the working class, was defeated by a vote of 66 to 85. Here, as throughout the conference the position of the NAC was to oppose the rights and oppose the lefts, to oppose the parliamentarians, and oppose the revolutionaries. The NAC with Brockway as spokesman opposed the resolution on the basis that it subordinated parliamentary activity to too great an extent. A counter resolution from Lancashire, introduced by Middleton Murray, who made a heart-rending, righteous speech, for the constitutional approach was overwhelmingly defeated. And a resolution to present Socialism as an "ethically superior" system was likewise defeated.

Another resolution from the London Divisional Council followed, asking the party to concentrate on the economic and industrial struggle as the basis for political activity, to take part side by side with the workers in their struggles, to seek united front activities towards building a united revolutionary movement in the country. But this too was defeated by a vote of 76 to 89. Shortly after that a resolution making the primary object for the ILP the capture of Parliament was also defeated.

In fact it seemed that any attempt to state the case clearly, whether the reformist or the revolutionary was defeated. In the whole section on Party Policy, the only resolutions passed were the non-committal ones: 1) that the ILP can best"be built" by active participation in the day to day struggle and that therefore "cooperation with all working class organizations" is part of the normal Party work; 2) that Conference "deprecates" the action of those who contravened Conference decisions, especially on the United Front;3) that branches "should carefully consider" the possibility of working in Trade Union Council unemployed organizations especially where the National Unemployed Workers Movement does not exist. To these might be added a few others which, although outside of this particular section, bear upon the policy of the ILP in the immediate future.

A resolution making it the duty for the ILP members to participate in the trade union, to develop the rank and file movement against the bureocracy of the unions, to organize trade union fractions, including an amendment making the payment of the political levy where necessary permissive, was also passed. When the ILP disassociated from the Labour Party, ILP members had ceased paying the political levy in their unions, which goes toward the Labour Party. As a result many ILP members had been disbarred from active participation in the trade unions. It is to be hoped that with this resolution passed, the ILP members will not only attempt to regain and strengthen their influence in the unions, but will also develop militant action and the rank and file movement against the reactionary bureocracy. Unfortunately the whole structure of the ILP at present is such that the resolution may well remain on paper, without a coordinated and determined drive being carried out.

The NAC recommendation for united front activity with the Communist Party on specific issues, requiring all members to carry out this minimum and permitting individual branches

and districts to carry on further united front activity if they deem it advisable, was also carried. The Conference likewise agreed to continue the Anti-War Movement in which the ILP and the CPGB have been the driving factors. The Conference had the opportunity of receiving most enthusiastically, the news that at the very same time the National Union of Distributive and Allied Workers, a union of 127,000 members had voted to join the Anti-War Movement.

The discussion on ILP anti-war work, made clear both the advances and the shortcoming of the Party. A resolution was passed which calls for the unconditional refusal to participate in any imperialist war, propaganda for general strike in the event of war, to use any opportunity afforded by a war to overthrow the capitalist system, the formation of anti-war councils, active effort of members of Parliament to expose and defeat the war menace. But the clause in the resolution calling for the planning of such work during a period of illegality was defeated by a vote of 69 to 73. The lead against illegal work was given by Elijah Sandham who warned the Conference that "London" was gradually leading the Party on to be an "insurrectionary party". True, resolutions which put faith in fairy tale peace pact proposals, in preventing the rearming of Germany and similar proposals were overwhelmingly defeated. True, the original resolution without the illegality clause passed without dissent, showing that the Party had to a great extent broken with its old pacifist attitudes. However, the vote and discussions made it clear that the majority was willing to declare unconditional opposition to imperialist war, but refused to meet the actual problem of how to oppose it, and would be incapable of carrying out a revolutionary struggle against it.

The problem which was of chief interest to the Conference was the one of international associations. Although it is impossible to separate the Party policy at home from its international associations, the two questions were discussed and considered in a manner which indicated that few realized the connection. However, the decisions on international relations were quite in keeping with the confused, centrist party policy.

Although there had been an exchange of letters between the CI and the ILP which made the CI attitude quite clear prior to the Conference, although the NAC was undoubtedly very well aware of the probable nature of the last minute cable from the CI, and of its own attitude towards the CI, irrespective of the CI's answer, it failed to give any lead prior to the Conference, submitted no recommendation. Instead, the NAC utilized the fact that it received a cable from the CI on the eve of the Conference, to bring in an emergency resolution at the same time scrapping all resolutions on international associations previously on the agenda. The NAC was probably well aware that the lack of clarity in Party ranks on international associations, it would be simpler to secure the passage of its "new international" resolution in a cloaked form, if the Party did not get the opportunity to discuss it and prepare for it prior to the Conference.

The NAC resolution 1) opposes the formation of a new international; 2) continues "to associate with the Independent Revolutionary Parties with a view to influencing them to work for establishment of an inclusive revolutionary international". The NAC recommendation further clouds the issue by declaring its readiness to associate with the CI in all efforts "which in the view of the ILP further the revolutionary struggle of the workers"

and by speaking of united action of the working class of the world. The key note of the recommendation is the association with the Independent Revolutionary Parties and a break with the CI -- with a number of phrases added to win the maximum support at Conference. Not only does the resolution definitely align the ILP with international centrism, but despite its declaration in opposition to the formation of a new international in reality is a definite step towards one. As C. K. Cullen of the RPC very well pointed out in discussion, it is very difficult to differentiate between association and an international with the narrow functions to which the NAC wants to limit it.

The four other tendencies in the ILP were represented in five amendments to this recommendation.

1) The Affiliation Committee, through the Dumphries branch, introduced a substitute resolution -- for the immediate affiliation to the CI as a sympathetic body. Actually this tendency had no significant strength. It was supported also by many who had criticisms and were not at all adherents of its program butwere anxious to express their attitude towards the fundamental principles of the CI. The resolution was defeated by a vote of 34 to 126. 2) Cullen (Poplar branch) of the RPC, which is in complete agreement with the principles of the CI, but has criticisms of the tactics, and in particular has doubts as to the extent to which democratic centralism is carried out in the CI, introduced a resolution asking for a delegation to meet with ECCI with a view of disposing of the outstanding differences, and affiliating as a sympathetic body upon assurances that democratic centralism would be faithfully carried out and that the ILP would retain its autonomy and independence subject to consultation. This too was defeated but with a greater vote in its favor -- 51 to 98. 3) The "isolationists" introduced a substitute resolution calling for the maintainance of the principles and independence of the ILP, cooperating with the CI in struggles against Capitalism, Imperialism, and War, but no affiliation, opposition to the formation of a new international. In discussion it was clear that the sponsors were not merely for temporary isolation, but that they were opposed to the fundamental principles of the CI, and in particular opposed to Communist discipline. This resolution was also defeated -- 56 to 101. 4) The Trotskyite supporters, through the Clapham branch, introduced a resolution calling for immediate negotiations for the formation of a new international. This resolution received a smashing defeat-- the vote was 20 to 137. 5) In addition the London and Southern Counties Divisional Council introduced an amendment opposing in particular, "the establishment of the proposed Fourth International which it regards as a menace to international working class unity, and in so far as it is sponsored by the Left Opposition Groups, as a menace to thesuccessful Socialist construction in the Soviet Union. This was also defeated with a vote of 64 to 107.

The original NAC recommendation carried with a vote of 102 to 64. It is to be regretted that for the sake of clarity within the ranks, no resolution appeared as a declaration of principle, without raising the question of immediate affiliations; i.e. disassociation from international reformism and centrism and a declaration that the statutes

and principles of the CI are the only basis upon which a Communist International or Communist Parties can be built. The overwhelming majority of the ILP will have nothing to do with the Second International because they have come face to face with the Labour Party in England and understand the meaning of open reformism. But at the same time the majority within the ILP have not grasped the meaning of centrism. It is for this reason that the strange paradox occurs— a considerable section desiring negotiations with both the CI and the Independent Revolutionary Parties. It is the job of the revolutionaries in the ILP first to differentiate themselves from centrists and centrism within the ILP by giving the revolutionary lead and proposing the revolutionary policy and approach to every issue facing the ILP and the British working class, in this manner exposing the centrists and the meaning and implications of centrism; and secondly to show wherein the Independent Revolutionary Parties fail to be revolutionary parties and the tremendous harm they do to the revolutionary movement.

Several amendments to Party rules were passed giving the NAC greater power to deal with members and sections who oppose party decisions. A resolution instructing the NAC to appoint a Commission on Party Organization to consider changes to bring party in line with "its declared revolutionary policy" was also passed. But a clause in this resolution calling for "provision for rapid transference to a type of organization capable of functioning under illegal conditions" was deleted here as it was in connection with the anti-war resolution. A resolution was introduced which attempted to outlaw organized groups within the party such as the Revolutionary Policy Committee, the Affiliation Committee and the "Unity Committee". The rights and lefts and the chairman, Maxton united on this issue and the resolution was defeated.

A most interesting discussion revolved about the report of the Guild of Youth, the youth section of the Ilp. The Guild of Youth has not only, in line with the decision of the ILP at Derby in 1933, negotiated with the YCI, but has gone further. A delegation of the Guild of Youth is shortly to meet a delegation of the YCI to consider sympathetic affiliation. The question was raised as to whether the Guild would abide by the decisions of the conference on international associations. This the chairman of the Guild, Huntz, refused to promise. After some discussion the conference decided to continue urging all branches to form branches of the Guild, and that the Guild is to have autonomy on the question of international associations as it has on other questions. It is to be noted that the Guild of Youth had refused to participate in the Conference of Independent Revolutionary Youth sections held in Holland in February, because it recognized that the conference was a step in the attempt to create a new international. And so while the ILP, the senior section, is breaking negotiations with the CI and is extending associations with the Independent Revolution-

ary Parties, the Guild of Youth has broken with the Independent Revolutionary Parties, and is extending its negotiations with the CI.

At Bradford the ILP disaffiliated from the Labour Party — a tremendous step forward. At York there were signs of further steps forward, a tendency to break with pacifism, for more discipline, for greater conscious activity in the trade unions, for united action with the CP and other forces in the labor movement. But clearly not only does great confusion still exist, but the centrists still have control of the party, and the decision on international associations not only stops it half way but tends to lead the party back, shows the direction in which the party will go unless the revolutionaries drive forward.

A great responsibility falls upon the shoulders of the Revolutionary Policy Committee. It alone is the force which is not swayed by sentimental attachment to the CP., but which is carefully seeking revolutionary clarity and is seeking the crystallization of a steady Communist force. It represents the bulk of the revolutionary elements in the ILP. They accept without reservation the principles of the CI and the CP, and desire Communist unity. But they are dissatisfied with the tactics of the CP and therefore desire the maintenance of the ILP in order to develop a revolutionary body with correct Communist tactics, striving for a united Communist Party in Great Britian. In this sense, it is most regrettable that the RP C has not yet come forward with a definite platform, with a clear program of action. Revolutionary clarity is the crying need of the ILP. Here the RP C must prepare to do much more.

We hope that the revolutionaires within the ILP will, during the coming year, achieve clarity within their own ranks and differentiate themselves sharply from the centrists and their policies, by developing their revolutionary theories through concrete application to the problems facing the British workers. Only to the extent that the RPC will do this and be successful in extending their influence in the Party, will the ILP develop a significant revolutionary section which will not only be ready to accept the principles of Communism but will be an important constructive force towards the achievement of Communist unity, correct Communist tactics, and the success of the world proletariat.

The Thirteenth Plenum of the ECCI.

1 - Old Formulae and New Facts.

The 13th session of the plenum of the executive committee of the C I (ECCI) took place in Moscow in December. It lasted fifteen days. Seventy-five speakers addressed it. The reports, discussions and theses have been published in great detail in a number of special editions of the Basel "Rundschau" (January, February) and International Press Correspondence.

It was the first plenum since the victory of Fascism in Germany. It was a question of drawing critical and positive conclusions from these events of international significance, of stating and eliminating the errors of the ultra-left course , of formulating the strategyand tactics of the struggle against the fascist dictatorship in Germany, against the growth of fascism in other countries and against the imperialist war danger.

What is the result? Inadequate and contradictory. The old formulae of the ultra-left tactics were practically all retained and upheld. Some of it was dropped silently and corrected. The characteristic feature of this session, however, was first of all that some of the old ultra-left tactical formulae were so re-interpreted that their content was fundamentally changed while it was maintained at the same time that everything was correct. Secondly, that frequently the facts mentioned contradicted the formulae; no one, however, either became aware of or spoke of this contradiction. Thirdly, that as a result of these contradictions the old false practice was sanctioned on the one hand and on the other no clear concrete directions were given so that the theoretical and practical confusion became even greater. The ultra-left course is in a crisis in which individual parts are dropped and others sharpened. This crisis is a result of the clash between the old ultra-left formulae and the new facts, their effect on the party membership especially in Germany and the substantiation of this criticism and the positive work of the Communist Party of Germany Opposition thru facts. In the following paragraphs these contradictions will be pointed out.

2. The Maturing of the Revolutionary Crisis

The thesis on "Fascism, War Danger and Tasks of the Communist Parties" states among other things: "The 'demand' created thereby (by the armament industry) for means of destruction and annihilation has in the past year led to an increase in production in individual branches of industry ... in a number of countries in connection with open inflation (U.S., England, Japan) the super-dumping (Japan) and hidden inflation (Germany). But such a drive in production for unproductive purposes or such speculative leaps in production... must in the long run necessarily lead to a still greater sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism."

First of all, the concrete question whether the present economic crisis can be overcome and what form the overcoming will take (continuation of mass unemployment, lowering of the standard of living of the working class, etc.) is being evaded; secondly, the overcoming of the lowest point in the crisis is mainly ascribed to re-armament and inflation.

Stalin thus contradicted this viewpoint in his report to the 17th Party Conference of the CP SU :

"Some are inclined to ascribe this phenomenon (the increase in production) exclusively to the influence of artificial factors of a war time and inflation boom period... But it would be a gross error to explain everything by the war time and inflation boom period. Such an analysis is incorrect, since certain industrial progress is not observed in separate or accidental fields but in all or almost all industrial countries, including countries with a stable currency. It is apparent that alongside of the war and inflation prosperity, the workings of the inner forces of capitalism make themselves felt... It is apparent that here we have a transition from the lowest point of the decline of industry, from the lowest point of the individual crisis to the depression not to an ordinary depression but to a depression of a special nature which will lead neither to a revival of industry nor back to the lowest point of the decline."

Furthermore, Stalin expressly and sharply opposes the view of an automatic transition to the revolution, a view which more or less formed the basis of the concept of the "third period".

"Some comrades believe that as soon as a revolutionary crisis occurs the bourgeoisie necessarily finds itself in a blind-alley position, that its end is predestined and the victory of the revolution thereby guaranteed; that it is only necessary to wait for the collapse of the bourgeoisie and to write resolutions of victory. This is a grave error. The victory of the revolution never comes about by itself. It must be prepared and fought for. But only a revolutionary party can prepare and win the revolution. There are times when there is an objectively revolutionary situation, when the bourgeoisie is on the verge of collapse, and yet the revolution does not come because there is no revolutionary party of the proletariat which possesses enough strength and authority in order to lead the masses and to take the power into its hands."

See 1932/33 in Germany. Facts have compelled the C I to reject sharply the view entertained by "some comrades" that the existence of a revolutionary crisis by itself guarantees the victory of the revolution. The Communist Party of Germany Opposition did this at a time when these views in the C I were on the order of the day, when it was creating harmful illusions and hindered the preparation of the revolution through the Communist Party.

3. The Essence of Fascism

The confusion continues. In the "thesis" fascism is defined as the "open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, chauvinist and imperialist elements of finance capital" which is correct as far as it goes, but it does not express accurately the essential elements of fascism. The confusion is due to the conception that a fascist dictatorship can be carried out even under the form of bourgeois democracy -- adherence to parliamentary forms with fascization of the bourgeois dictatorship· while, in reality, the fascist dictatorship may well be prepared for within the framework of bourgeois democracy, these two forms of bourgeois class rule

or the dictatorship of capital are opposites (even though not complete opposites) which mutually eliminate and exclude each other. The victory of one is the decline of the other. The transition is born out of a contradiction of the struggle.

This undialectical view, which takes into account only the transition and not the contradiction and the struggle, led to the well-known explanation, before the victory of fascism, that the governments of Bruening, Papen, Schleicher were forms of the fascist dictatorship and thus true character and the real danger of the real fascist movement were obscured. And now?

Marty(France); " In France fascization does not at all develop according to the models set by Germany and Italy. As a matter of fact, the bourgeoisie combines and applies two methods: The method of open fascization and the far more dangerous method of the utilization of the democratic sentiments of the masses."

Manuilski: " To the French bourgeoisie, for example, the veil of bourgeois democracy, which serves as a cover for fascist methods, represents a ready-made ideology for the future imperialist war with Germany." Manuilski says further: "One must not internationalize German fascism, one must not force the same tactical methods on all parties." But the national peculiarities of the development of fascism in individual countries, which, to be sure, are to be noted, have nothing to do with the erroneous conception that in some countries bourgeois democracy might yield its place to the fascist dictatorship without a sudden leap, without a coup d'etat, that it could be its representative or substitute. That is indeed merely therepetition of the same illusion which was rampant in Germany and expressed itself in the slogan: "Germany is not Italy".

4. "Social-fascism "

The theory of "social-fascism" is retained in the thesis as well as in the reports. However, due to the pressure of events the content has been transformed. The original conception was : By itself or together with the "national-fascists" (i.e. the real fascists) Social Democracy will be the organizational supporter of the fascist dictatorship. What is the origin of this complete misinterpretation of the situation? It originates from the mechanical transference of the phenomena of the Russian counter-revolution when Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries merged with the White Guardists. Now the thesis maintains (after the events) that the victorious fascist dictatorship "drives away, splits and disintegrates" or "liquidates" the Social-Democratic parties. However, at the same time Kuusinen in his report maintains: "Fascists and social-fascists are and remain despite all their differences twin brothers, as Comrade Stalin has said". Stalin had expressly stated that facism and social democracy do not exclude each other but rather "supplement" each other and jointly exercise power. This is the erroneous transference of the role of the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries in relation to the White Guardists in Russia.

5. "Social-fascism" Remains the "Main Social Prop of the Bourgeoisie"

The thesis definitely emphasises: "Social democracy continues to be the main social prop, even in countries of open fascist dictatorship..."

In other words, the old false formula is retained. But what becomes of its substance?

Knorin (CPSU) states in his detailed report that victorious fascism smashes Social-Democracy "because Social-Democracy was still strong enough to keep the masses from resisting the onrush of the fascist dictatorship, thanks to its system of centralized organizations, but it was not strong enough to guarantee the stability of the capitalist regime thru its support." This, of course, means the liquidation of the "main social prop", because if there is any meaning whatsoever attached to this term it is that Social-Democracy was the decisive force which guaranteed the social rule of capital. Since it was no longer able to do this, the bourgeoisie turned to fascism as its "main social prop". Knorin further proves: "Secondly, Social-Democracy of today could only secure a place in the bourgeois government under parliamentarism, considering the enormous centralization of state power. It has become superfluous in the government apparatus itself. Thirdly, Social-Democracy has lost its influence among the masses because of the growing misery of the masses." It would be more accurate to say that the influence of Social-Democracy has in some countries been considerably lessened. What, however, remains of the "main social prop", if Social Democracy has become superfluous in the government and has in addition lost its mass influence? It still functions as the prop of bourgeois class rule but not as the "main prop".

Manuilski (CPSU): "The fundamental question which determines the role of Social-Democracy under bourgeois dictatorship is: Is Social-Democracy, even after Hitler's seizure of power, an agent of capitalism within the working class, an agent which splits the proletariat, thereby facilitating the victory of fascism and consequently helping to support capitalism? Has the position of Social-Democracy, after having been thrown out of the Reichstag, changed on the question of its relation to the C P, on the Soviet Union, on the proletarian revolution, on the class struggle, on the united front against fascism? No, comrades. And it follows that Social-Democracy as is correctly stated in the thesis remains the "main social prop of the bourgeoisie". This is, of course, a sophist twist. The premise is correct, the conclusion false. It only follows that Social-Democracy represents, even after the victory of fascism, a prop of capitalist class rule; it further follows that its liquidation is the essential prerequisite for the victory of the proletarian dictatorship. But it does not follow that it is still the decisive prop which it had been, to be sure, under the bourgeois democratic republic.

6. The Victory of Fascism Without the Defeat of the Working Class.

All through the thesis and the reports it is maintained that fascism won without a defeat being suffered by the working class. Maintaining the contrary is branded "defeatism". Undoubtedly, there was "defeatism" in the ranks of the German working class after the victory of fascism, spreading even to the camp of the communists. But of what did this "defeatism" consist? The doubt that the working class will again be able to rise and score a victory, in the exaggeration of the consequences of the defeat, but certainly not in the recognition of the simple fact that fascist counter-revolution and not the proletarian revolution had been victorious. How are the Social-Democratic workers to be persuaded to break with reformism if it is not admitted that the working class has suffered a defeat primarily through the reformist policies of the Social-Democracy? Defeat and destruction are two separate things.

This contradiction manifests itself in a peculiar form with Ercoli (C P of Italy). According to him the Italian working class, to be sure, suffered a defeat through the victory of Mussolini, but the German working class did not. "What", he asks, "does a defeat of the working class really mean? With us it means that not only was the working class forced to give up various positions it held but in addition every section of the working class was smashed, broken up so that all connections of the party with the masses were severed and every possibility of re-establishing connections taken away. But what we know of the position of the Party in Germany since Hitler's rule indicates that the situation is quite different from that facing us after Mussolini." If the relation between the position of the C P of Italy and the C P of Germany after the victory of fascism were as Ercoli describes it to be, then, this would only prove that the C P of Germany had recovered more quickly from its defeat, but it would not prove that it had not suffered a defeat along with the rest of the working class. In reality, however, as is well-known, the C P of Italy remained legal for some time after the victory of Mussolini, the trade unions continued to exist. The statement of Ercoli can only be looked upon as a diplomatic bow to the prescribed official formula. But Manuilski says: "There is no doubt but that the victory of fascism in Germany signifies a heavy blow not only to the German working class." What is the difference between "a heavy blow" and a defeat? Also take into account the statement of Piatnitski: "At the moment of the upheaval the influence of the C P in the factories was very small."

7. The United Front

Kuusinen: "Against Social-Democracy, for the united front with the working masses. That is the chief task today. Does this mean that the C P which carries out a correct bolshevist line should under no circumstances propose a united front to the leaders of the Socialist Party or the reformist trade unions? This question was posed in the last session of the presidium. We answer: There is no such law of bolshevist tactics. In the spring the Plenum sent its well-known Open Letter to all Social-Democratic parties.

Consequently, there are exceptional cases when bolshevist tactics not only permit but presuppose such proposals to social-fascists having a considerable mass influence."

And on what are these "exceptional cases" based? Apparently, not only on the reformist mass influence, because that still exists in a number of countries. What this turn to the leaders of the reformist organizations in "exceptional cases" is founded on is not stated. Practically it means that Communist Parties will further continue to disregard the united front when it is absolutely necessary and instead of that play tail-end politics as the French Communist Party did on February 6,1934. It will lag behind the Social-Democracy instead od driving the masses and the leaders ahead. We further ask: Why was that which was correct in the Spring of 1934 when the ECCI proposed it, wrong when the Communist Party Opposition constantly demanded a united front(to be sure without a non-aggression pact) before Hitler s seizure of power?

8 Red Trade Union Tactics

First of all, red trade unions are approved of and , secondly, their bankruptcy is shown by the facts. Yet there is no clarification of the Why and Wherefore of this bankruptcy. In fact, the question of the causes is not really posed.

Piatnitski says: "The revolutionary miners' union in Scotland has only 3,000 members. The reformists have 20,000 The C P of England has no influence in the reformist miners' union. After the split in the Scotch Miners' Union all communists left the reformist unions." Piatnitski further says: "The organizations which stood behind the C P(which includes the red trade unions) did not embrace the broad masses of workers, while we did not conduct any fight against reformism within the reformist and Christian organizations."

Wassiljev says: "When fascist reaction destroyed the mass organizations the communists who belonged to these mass organizations did not possess strong fractions and consequently were also split and disorganized."

Kostanjan(R.I.L.U) states among other things: "In some of our trade unions democracy is only on paper". Furthermore, "the content, methods and forms of work of the party and the trade unions frequently do not differ at all. Even the membership is sometimes completely the same in fractions and trade unions or groups". And concluding, he said:

"Despite the most determined instructions (!) of the C I and the RILU fraction on the necessity of leading the trade unions through the party we must admit today again at the 13th plenum that as far as the relation between the trade unions and the party organizations is concerned everything is as of old. In most countries communist trade union fractions do not exist. If they do exist, then, mostly on paper. On the whole, however they get along without fractions."

What is this but a declaration of bankruptcy of the tactics of the RIL U ? But the representative of the RIL U neither questions whether these tactics leading directly to such a result are correct: nor does he propose a change. The RILU line is continued. A few examples to show where it leads:

Hernandez (Spain) announces:

"We must start preparing for the founding of the C GTU (new independent labor federation) without any delay." and at the same time,"strengthen our work in the reformist and anarchist trade unions." That this CGTU will be still-born is clear from the very start.

Weinstone (America): "A new question which has come up recently is the creation of independent unions. A great number of workers have refused to enter the A.F.of L., at the same time staying away from the revolutionary trade unions. Under these circumstances the party must create the slogan of the creation of independent unions, on the basis of a class program and a militant leadership." The work for the creation of "revolutionary trade unions" is continued at the same time. The party, therefore, creates two kinds of revolutionary trade unions alongside the A. F. of L., the reformist mass organization, which has won almost one-half million members within the last few months.

9. Ultra-Centralism

Piatnitski states: "Before the transition to illegality the party in Germany "was bound by unbelievable centralization, by ultra-centralism". He demands, "decentralization". They should not have waited until the period of illegality. The initiative of local organizations is of extraordinary great importance.

Correct. But this is not merely a question of organizationtion. It is above all, a question of the proper functioning of inner party democracy-- a question which has been posed by the Communist Party of Germany Opposition for many years.

10. The Old Sickness

We repeat that the above explanations do not critically nor postively exhaust the criticism of the 13th plenum. In the next number of "The Road to Communism" we will deal with a number of questions chiefly in relation to problems of strategy and tactics of the struggle against fascism.

We conclude with the following statement of Bela Kun:

"We must remind ourselves of our old sickness. We have the correct tactics but fail to work them out. In orther words: We often substitute for the tactics of a certain period of the class struggle the constant repetition of our general principle and tactical slogans. Our task is to work out concrete methods peculiar to each country on the basis of the international main task of the struggle for soviet power."

Is it not time to realize the causes of the "old sickness", the non-existence of a collective international leadership of the C I. At any rate, it is true that the concrete operation of leadership which carries on in the Soviet Union is not carried on in the C I. This can be accomplished only collectively.

WHAT NEXT FOR THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN CZECHO-SLOVAKIA?

(OPEN LETTER OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OPPOSITION TO THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA)

Dear Comrades:

The Theses of the 13th Plenum of the ECCI have been published by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. The Theses show that the leadership of the Comintern has learned nothing whatsoever from the most important events which have occurred since the XII plenum of the ECCI. The victory of fascism in Germany and its growth in a number of capitalist countries, the defeat of the working class and the stagnation of revolutionary forces as compared to the rapid growth of reactionary and fascist forces has not yet made the leaders of the CI think. The method, of simply denying the defeat instead of learning from it and creating the forces necessary to overcome it must fill every honest communist with apprehension. Not only is it impossible in this manner to overcome the defeat of the German working class, but the weaknesses of the international communist movement are continued until some day it will face the fate of the German working class.

Comrades: We appeal to you because we know that you do not want the collapse of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Comintern. You must cooperate with us in trying to prevent the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Communist International from pursuing a course which in Germany has led to the defeat of the German working class. In this open letter we want to show you how the CI leadership misunderstands the world situation and how wrong its tactics are, in order to point out clearly the dangers accruing therefrom and in order to induce you to correct this suicidal course.

By simply denying the bad consequences, in fact, even perverting them, the CI leadership finds it unnecessary really to examine its political course. They know nothing of the defeat of the German working class; they fail to see that the revolutionary movement is both split and impotent in comparison with the reactionary fascist forces. The basis of this optimistic, unfortunately too deceptive viewpoint, is the theory of the "third period", which was revived by the XIIIth Plenum. To quote from the theses of the XIIIth Plenum:

> "The development of the general crisis of capitalism, after the end of relative stabilization--which was stated by the last (XII) Plenum of the ECCI--has already led to a far-reaching collapse of the capitalist system in the whole world.
>
> "The growth of fascism and its coming into power in Germany and in a number of other capitalist countries means a) the revolutionary crisis and the indignation of the broad masses against the rule of capital is growing.
>
> "The extraordinary tension of inner class contradiction within the capitalist countries, as well as international contradictions, show such maturing objective conditions of the revolutionary crisis that at present the world is entering upon a new stage of revolutions and wars."

What does the leadership of the CI mean by saying this?

1. the relative stabilization of capitalism is at an end and has already led to a widespread breakdown of the capitalist system in the whole world. 2. This breakdown is accompanied by the deepening of the revolutionary crisis.

But this theory is economics and opportunism of the worst sort. It starts out with the assumption that the economic crisis is of necessity bound up with the growth of revolutionary forces, that the revolutionary crisis arises automatically out of the economic crisis, runs parallel with it, so to speak. Thus, the political results of the ultra-left course of the Comintern based on such theories can be easily "proven."

The relative stabilization of capitalism is more than a mere economic phenomenon; it implies more than the ending of the economic phases of crises. If the change from the depression period to the prosperity period of capitalism were relative stabilization, then, it would only be another word for capitalist prosperity. In this connection Knorin very correctly states in the Communist International (part 15-16):

> "Capitalist stabilization originated with the smashing of the workers' revolutionary movement in the central European countries by the bourgeoisie in the years 1920-1923."

Relative stabilization is most closely related to the overthrow of the revolutionary movement. From that it follows that stabilization of capitalism is the removal of the direct threat to capitalist rule, is the end of the acute revolutionary situation.

But that which applies for the beginning of stabilization must also apply to its end. Only when an acute revolutionary situation sets in, only when the struggle of the working classes for power begins anew, only then has the end of relative stabilization come.

None, not even the Comintern leadership, can maintain that we have such a situation either in Germany or in any other capitalist nation. On what basis, then, does the ECCI assume that relative stabilization is at an end? Obviously on the existence of the world economic crisis which, however, does not exist only since the middle of 1932 when the ECCI plenum affirmed the end of relative stabilization but had already begun in the year 1929. According to the theory of the Comintern, then, stabilization was already going to its end in 1929.

Since even the Comintern leadership sees how untenable are "assertions", it speaks of a "transition period" to a new stage of revolutions and wars. What, then, is the transition period, this division of time "between the end of capitalist stabilization and the phase of revolutions and wars" as Manuilski said at the XII ECCI Plenum? The end of stabilization without an acute revolutionary situation means nothing else than that every way out of the crisis is closed to the capitalist class even if no proletarian revolution comes. Thus they maintain that stabilization has come to an end, not thru the workers' beginning struggles for power, not thru the direct threat to the rule of capital but thru the economic crisis.

The Social-Democracy consoled the workers with the prospect of the end of the crisis after which everything would become better; and the Communist party states that capitalist prosperity can under no circumstances return since the period of stabilization is over. In reality, however, capitalism is seeking a capitalist way out of the crisis thru the setting-up of a fascist dictatorship. Fascism is, in essence, the brutal attempt to make possible intensified economic exploitation through the political defeat of

the working class to bring about by force the capitalist way out of the crisis through the shifting of the burdens of the crisis onto the working class. Therefore, it is necessary to carry on the sharpest struggle against fascism in the countries fast becoming fascist. For this fight, however, there is needed the broadest mobilization of the working masses. This struggle is crippled and hindered by the "Theory of the Third Period", through the talk of the end of relative stabilization without an acute revolutionary situation, through the talk of the "transition period to a new stage of revolutions and wars."

Only when one sees reality through the glasses of the Comintern leadership can one prove the opposite. We wish here, therefore, to present one more classic example to prove the existence of a "revolutionary crisis", how one simply corrects the truth in order to fit in with the theories of the CI leadership. Karl Neumann (Prague) writes in an article: "For the German Revolution" (Kaempfer N. 2, 1934) the following:

> "The powerful German proletariat was, as a consequence of the unheard of treachery of the Social-Democracy, forced, by the bloody Hitler bands, to retreat, but thanks to the heroic struggle and the correct tactics of the Communist Party it was not defeated."

Comrade Neumann, who here only thoughtlessly repeats what Heckert and the whole Comintern dictate to him, ought then to tell the communist workers what a defeat is since that which the German working class suffered was not a defeat. When Neumann says that the German proletariat is not defeated, he surely does not, in this connection, refer to it in the historical sense, in the sense that the proletariat in spite of everything will sin socialism. That, to be sure, would be no special discovery of Neumann's. But, if he means that the concrete situation in which the German working class finds itself today politically, then he is maintaining a flagrant imbecility. Fascism has given battle and the working class has lost. Fascism is the conqueror, the working class the conquered, even though the victory of Fascism is not everlasting.

If the fact that the victory of fascism is not a permanent one would prove that the working class has not been defeated, then there can never be any such thing as the defeat of the proletariat or the smashing of the labor movement. Fascism has brutally defeated the German working class, has destroyed its mass organizations as independent mass organizations, has smashed its political parties and forced them to be illegal, to rebuild their organization under tremendous sacrifices and to organize the struggle against fascism. If this is not a defeat, then what is? Instead of realizing facts, instead of talking about them, and thus showing the full extent of the tremendous task before the German working class, thus clarifying the road for a new rise, we have dilly-dallying and self-deception which once before have proven to be fatal in Germany because the danger of fascism was minimized and the defense against fascism had thus been crippled.

The same confusion exists in the analysis and estimate of fascism. Just as in the past the CI leaders failed to understand the essence of fascism and failed to explain it correctly and were thus unable to suggest the means of combating it, so today they are still clinging to their analysis. The comrades of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia who are still fighting to avoid the fate of the German Communist Party should, therefore, in their own interest remember the following:

The Communist Party of Germany and the Communist International looked upon the Bruening and later on the Papen and Schleicher governments as carrying through the fascist dictatorship. They saw no principle differences between bourgeois democracy and fascist dictatorship, they regarded their differences as well as the difference between the party of Hitler and the Social-Democracy as "liberalism".

Thus everything was one and the same thing for the Communist International and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany.

They saw no differences. How could there be a danger of fascism if there is no difference between bourgeois democracy and fascism? How could the masses be mobilized against the threatening danger if it did not exist at all? Instead of showing the similarities between fascism and social-democracy, namely that both meant the carrying out of the class rule of the bourgeoisie, the CI and the CPG theoreticians saw only an indistinct, gray mist. Bourgeois democracy and fascism are not opposites as far as social content is concerned; both are forms of the class rule of capital, both embody the dictatorship of capital. But these are forms of the rule of capital which exclude each other. Fascist dictatorship is the elimination and smashing of bourgeois democracy. It is the process by which the state burocracy is made independent and merges with the fascist mass party which sucks it up and which penetrates it. Fascist dictatorship eliminates all bourgeois democratic rights, destroys all bourgeois parties, establishes the monopoly rule by the fascist party and smashes all independent organizations of the working class. It elevates violence and terror into a state principle. How even today Communist leaders in the face of the bitter experiences in Germany can say that bourgeois democracy and fascist dictatorship are not opposites is inconceivable. To quote from the theses of the last 13th Plenum:

> "Born in the womb of bourgeois democracy, fascism in the eyes of the capitalists is a means of saving capitalism from collapse. It is only for the purpose of deceiving and disarming the workers that social-democracy denies the fascization of bourgeois democracy and makes a contrast between the democratic countries and the countries of the fascist dictatorship in principle."

It is natural that on this basis even today, in countries which are not yet fascist the old theories should be held precisely those theories which crippled and prevented the fight of the workers against fascism and against the policy of capitulation, against the treacherous policy of reformism. By confusing bourgeois democracy with fascist dictatorship the struggle against the dictatorship of capital is not strengthened, no matter in what political form it presents itself. On the contrary, the forces are drawn away from the central danger and limited in their struggle. A real fight against fascism, not only through phrases, in the more or less democratic countries is at the same time the most effective fight against bourgeois democracy and against the treacherous policy of social-democracy, which objectively furthers fascism because it tries to win over the workers for the interests of capital. The fight against fascism is at the same time the fight against the parliamentary and democratic illusions of the workers, because it will, on the one hand, show the true character of bourgeois democ-

racy and reformism to the broad masses, and in order to be effective it will, on the other hand, do away more and more with the prejudice of the reformist workers and finally it will be waged on the basis of communist strategy and tactics.

In order to explain away to the workers its real inactivity and insufficient mobilization, the CI leadership invented the theory that fascism is the antipode of the revolutionary upsurge, i.e. that the growing revolutionary danger, the threat to the rule of capital by the working class had brought fascism into existence as a counter movement. The opposite is the case. Fascism was able to develop as the working class became more impotent. The inability of the proletariat to struggle, the splits within the working class movement, were the conditions not only for the growth of fascism but also for bourgeoisie to risk a fascist coup d'etat because it no longer feared the working class.

Always when the working class increased its revolutionary power the bourgeoisie tried to hide behind the protecting wall of bourgeois democracy, the bourgeoisie tried through concessions which led to a split in the working class and thus to secure its social rule. It abandoned "democracy" at the moment when the bourgeoisie was able to afford this provocation, because it felt that the working class was weak enough due to the reformist policy which kept the masses from struggling and due to the ultra-left course of the Communist Party of Germany which was unable to mobilize the masses. It utilized the impotence of the proletariat whose mighty revolutionary power it had felt previously, in order to chain it more firmly and render it incapable of struggling. The following is an example.

After July 20, after the coup d'etat in Prussia , a conflict broke out in the camp of the counter revolution between the feudal-monarchial clique (Papen-Schleicher) and the fascist wing (Hitler) it was evident that not only had the petty bourgeois democracy but also the working class had practically left the political field of battle. The fact that the Socialist Party of Germany and the bourgeois democrats were not ready to fight had already been demonstrated on the 20th of July. The revolutionary section of the working class, however, the Communist Party of Germany was impotent. No one responded to its call for a general strike, since it lacked the necessary base in the proletarian mass organizations. Thus, the conflict in the camp of counter-revolution demonstrated and confirmed anew the political insignificance of the working class. This conflict which was temporarily ended on August 13th was only possible because there was nothing to fear from the working class. On July 20th, the counter revolution marched in united ranks against the common enemy, the working class and the petty-bourgeois democracy. A few days later, however, this was eliminated and the fight was carried to its conclusion in their own camp because no further resistance on the part of the working class was expected.

That was the real situation in Germany a few months before the establishment of a fascist dictatorship. What have your ultra-left leaders learned from this, comrades? In a declaration on the "position of the renegade Guttman", the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia writes:

> "They (the renegades, Trotzkyites, etc) cannot understand that fascism is counter-revolution and that it exists because of a growth in the forces of the revolution."

Ultra-leftism is trump. The ultra-left leaders have learned nothing and have forgotten nothing.

On the "theoretical" basis that "fascism and bourgeois democracy, the Hitler party and social-democracy, are not opposites" the theory of "social fascism" originated. This theory is the basis of the united front from below which in reality is no united front at all. This conception is desperately clung to despite its devastating consequences but the situation aggravated by the nonsensical statement that the social-democracy remains the main social prop of the bourgeoisie even in the countries of open fascist dictatorship.

Instead of exposing the actual role of the social-democracy the CI wastes its energy in name-calling of the worst sort. The social-democracy as a wing of the bourgeoisie as the representative of the interests of capital in the working class, is a part of the petty bourgeois democracy. It is not a wing of fascism but a wing of petty bourgeois democracy; its opposite is fascism as opposed to petty bourgeois democracy. We have just shown what this difference consists of.

Just as democracy was destroyed and smashed by fascism, so the Socialist Party of Germany was also destroyed and smashed. But isn't it queer that the bourgeoisie which has been adopting better physicians, "physicians" with butchers' knives, a better prop, namely the bloody fascist regime, that this same bourgeoisie should persecute and smash its "social main prop" (according to the CI theory)? In order to understand this, one must be a leader of the CI, our layman's knowledge is entirely insufficient!

All these theories, comrades, which are presented to you as Marxist and Leninist theories are designed in reality to blind you to the fruitlessness of the ultra-left tactics of the CI.

Comrades: In this way your organizations are more and more disintegrating; this puts arguments into the hands of the Trotzkyites which enable them to lead the fight against Communism and against the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia as well as the CI.

You must demand that your leaders pose and answer the following questions:

Why did fascism conquer in Germany despite the correct line of the CPG. Why couldn't the CPG prevent it?

Why does the fascist danger grow in a number of capitalist countries?

Why is there a lack of growth in the revolutionary forces?

Why have the objectively favorable conditions led to a counter-revolution and not to a proletarian revolution?

To pose these questions is to question the ultra-left course.

The statement that the reformists betrayed and that, therefore, the communists could not fight is no answer to the question which today thousands of proletarians are asking the Communist Party of Germany, because reformists will always betray. That the German social-democracy would not and could not fight on the basis of its bourgeois position towards the state and capitalism in general has been clear to every communist for a long time.

Reformism bears the chief blame for the victory of fascism in Germany because it tied and betrayed the working class to the interests of capitalism, because it rendered the working class impotent and kept it back from a united front struggle with the communists against fascism and capitalism.

But why didn't the Communist Party of Germany succeed in winning over to communism the workers who had been betrayed by the reformist leaders?

Why did the masses of the workers and petty bourgeoisie, disillusioned with reformism go over to fascism instead of communism?

The ultra-left tactics of the party are to blame for this.

Through the inability of the Communist Party of Germany to analyze correctly and combat the fascist danger, the essence of fascism, it could not mobilize the masses against the fascist danger.

Through the theory of social-fascism and the false united front tactics based on it, from below only, through the false trade union policy as well as the false attitude to all proletarian mass organizations, the CPG isolated itself from the social-democratic workers whom in reality it should have and wanted to win over.

The ultra-left course is to be blamed for the fact that the Communist Party of Germany was unable to break the influence of reformism on decisive sections of the working class. and that the workers disillusioned by reformism, did not come to communism but were driven into the camp of fascism. The ultra-left course is to be blamed for the fact that in decisive situations the Communist Party of Germany lacked the lever for the relase of mass action. This is true not only of the Communist Party of Germany but of the Communist International and all its sections.

Instead of developing a correct united front policy, that is, to propose from time to time definite objectives to the reformist organizations, to propagate these slogans among the social-democratic workers and to exert pressure on the reformist organizations through this, to tie up this common struggle with persistent propagandizing of communist principles as well as through patient enlightenment of the workers on the essence of reformism, to win them over for communism, they babbled about the united front from below only.

Instead of developing within the trade unions a planned program for mobilization for the struggle against fascism and against reformist capitulation, instead of using the trade unions and other mass organizations for the propagation of communist aims and principles, they waste costly time during the rise of fascist counter-revolution by forming red trade unions and red organizations incapable of struggle and isolated.

There was lacking in the decisive situations in Germany not the will to struggle on the part of the CPG, that was there alright, but the lever to release great actions was lacking, since the CPG through its ultra-left course had not been powerful enough to break the influence of the SPG on the great masses of workers.

The Comintern leadership has not learned anything from all these facts. It writes in the theses of the XIIIth ECCI Plenum:

> "The Plenum approves without reservation the resolution of the Presidium of the ECCI of April 1, 1933 on the situation in Germany and the political line which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany, with Comrade Thaelmann at the head, pursued up to and at the moment of the fascist revolution. The Plenum emphasizes the bolshevik heroic struggle against the fascist dictatorship."

At the same time the history of the ultra-left course during the last year shows clearly the vacillation between right and wrong. This period was characterized by half turns which only serve to increase the contradictions of the ultra-left course.

Thus in the beginning of March the Comintern issued an appeal in which a turn toward correct united front tactics had been made. However, it was too late. The appeal stated that the Communist Party of Germany had already on July 20th, 1932 proposed the united

front for common action.

Moreover, sections affiliated to the Communist International had been instructed once more to attempt to realize the united front with the social-democratic workers through the socialist parties.

This appeal was a refutation of the hitherto applied ultra-left tactics. It was also the refutation of the theory of social fascism because with fascists you cannot make a united front.

This turn came too late. It could not be comprehended by the members nor was there time and possibility to make up what had been lost in the four years of the ultra-left course. Today this correct turn is again forgotten.

The instruction of the Communist International to its sections to turn not only to the membership but also to the trade unions and the Social-Democratic organizations themselves was the silent recognition of the year-long criticism of the Communist Party Opposition.

During this turn the ultra-left leadership made an opportunist error by swallowing the non-aggression pact of the Socialist Party of Germany. The appeal says that it is possible under the condition of recognition of a program of action, "to give up the attacks on the Social-Democratic organizations during the time of the action against the capitalist offensive, against fascism."

That was the struggle of the ultra-left politicians who had lost their heads against reformism!

The united front presupposes the freedom of criticism and the propaganda of communist principles and demands solely the disciplined action of the participating parties.

Today, however, the XIIIth Plenum has again revived the united front from below only. Everything good has been forgotten.

The same may be said of the trade union line. In the last moment, just before the coordination of the trade unions by the Nazis, the Central Committee passed a resolution which demanded entering the reformist trade unions, fighting in these trade unions for positions, and also to fight against abandoning them, i.e. all the demands of the Communist Party of Germany (Opposition) with the exception that the CPG first drew up these demands when they were no longer correct, because the smashing of the trade unions by the fascists had already started in the middle of March. But even after the coordination of the trade unions, the slogan was kept while the correct slogan then was the creation of independent, illegal trade unions. In the embittered ideological fight of the CPG-O with the CPG and through its practical experiences, the CPG accepted the correct slogan of the CPG-O, made it its own, without, however, liquidating its Red Trade Union course, which still impedes the way to a true trade union policy.

We believe that we have shown here how the ultra-left course has led the Communist movement to the worst political failures and how it has brought disintegration and weakness.

If the CI leadership and the leadership of the Communist Party of Germany are not capable of learning from history, then, you comrades must force them to take off their ultra-left glasses.

In Czechoslovakia too, fascist forces are marching forward while the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia is marching in one place. You must, because of the above cited experiences, make a better job than did the Communist Party of Germany.

Demand the execution of a correct communist united front policy. Demand that the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, locally as well as from the center, be forced into common actions with the SP

through agreement on concrete objectives.

Break the sabotage of the SP by propagating your proposals among the masses of the Social-Democratic workers. In this way a possibility will be given to the communists to mobilize the Social-Democratic workers against the policy of coalition now being pursued by their party, against their policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie. This will bring the social democratic workers nearer to communism.

Work together with the CPO of Czechoslovakia and the SP of Czechoslovakia for the establishment of united front organs without which the common struggle cannot be fought. Demand the creation of non-partisan defense organizations against fascism.

If this campaign is to be effective, then, it must be accompanied with true communist work in the proletarian mass organizations, above all, the trade unions. It is necessary to lead a fight to reinstate the communist trade unions, the industrial unions, into the reformist trade unions, into the reformist "free trade unions" in order to defend them against reformist capitulation, in order to establish connections between Communist and Social-Democratic workers and to make of these unions a weapon of struggle against capitalism.

In the thesis of the XIIIth Plenum there is missing the formulation of such transitional slogans which will rally the fighting workers for the struggle for power. The slogan of workers control of production is one such slogan. Along with propagandizing communist objectives, this slogan is an important means for convincing, in practice, the workers of the necessity of the struggle for power in practice. In order to lead the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the Comintern to such correct communist tactics the broadest discussion within the party and the CI concerning these questions is necessary. The Burocratic degeneration in the party, the introduction of mechanical discipline and the prevention of the discussion of party tactics and policies before their acceptance have become the worst evils in the communist movement. For that reason you must demand the reestablishment of democratic centralism in the organization.

Comrades! We know that the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia will try to weaken our arguments through the persecution of our supporters as "renegades". We believe, however, that this will not stop you from examining our serious and objective criticism, which grows out of our serious concern about the communist movement.

Fight inside the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia against ultra-leftism and for the return of the CP of Czechoslovakia and the CI to Leninist tactics. By fighting for this you are fighting for the rebuilding of the Communist movement and against its further disintegration through ultra-leftism.

By doing this you will be strengthening the working class front in the struggle against reaction and fascism, because you will free the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia of a sterile, paralyzing political line.

With communist greetings

Communist Party of Czechoslovakia S.R.
(Opposition)

THE CLASS WAR IN AUSTRIA

Historical Background and Course of Events.

In 1930 the Vaugoin-Starhemberg-Seipel government had entered into negotiations with Mussolini. The Heimwehr had already attempted a putsch in 1931 in Styria, with arms from Italy. Before the action of the Heimwehr and of Dolfuss, the Italian assistant secretary of state, Suvich, had been in Vienna where, evidently the conspiracy against the the Social Democracy was decided upon with Dolfuss and Starhemberg.

Since March 7,1933, the day of the coup d'etat of the Dollfuss-Fey government, the acts of violence on the part of the government against the working class, against its organizations, against all democratic rights, became more and more frequent. Parliamentary bodies were prohibited, the Provincial as well as the Federal. Government by decree was introduced. The Republican Schutzbund (the defense organization of the Austrian Social Democracy) was outlawed and dissolved; the right of assembly and the freedom of the press for the working class were practically abrogated. The Viennese municipal government, the main stronghold of the Viennese Social Democrats was robbed of its income in order to paralyze its activities. The railroad men were forced to enter the "Patriotic Front". The Social Democracy did not respond to these blows with action; again and again it held back the workers whose resentment grew daily.

Under the pressure ofembittered workers demanding a struggle the last party convention of the Austrian Social Democracy in the autumn of 1933 decided that the general strike would be resorted to as a weapon only if the following four conditions arose: a) the imposition of a fascist constitution; b) the deposing of the Viennese municipal council or of a provincial diet; c) the dissolution of the party; d) the "coordination" of the trade unions. The purpose of this resolution was to hold back, as long as possible the masses from a real struggle through a piece of paper which promised future action. In order to do away with the discontent of the workers over the passivity of the Party leadership, a committee of factory workers , a sort of assitant council of the Party,was created .

The Party leadership based its passivity on the promise which Dollfuss had given to the French governments since Daladier that he would not use violence against the Austrian Social Democracy. Similar promises had been given to England. Dollfuss and Starhemberg took the overthrow of the Daladier cabinet (February 7,1934) as a pretext in order to execute their plan of destroying the Socialist Party of Austria. (The Foreign Minister Barthou of the French cabinet of "National Unity" headed by Doumergue, had had this promise renewed.)

The action of Dollfuss-Starhemberg was introduced by the march of the Heimwehr in the Tyrol. They threatened to take possession of the governmental and municipal buildings. They demanded, through an ultimatum, the withdrawal of the provincial governments and their replacement with their own people; the exclusion of the Social Democracy from the provincial and the municipalities; the dissolution of the Socialist Party of Austria. At the same time, Fey arrested the District and local leaders of the Schutzbund in Vienna and in the provinces, in order to disorganize the Schutzbund and to confiscate the weapons of the Schutzbund. On February 10th, Fey announced in a provocative manner that the weapons found testify to a "conspiracy of the Marxist-bolshevist scoundrels". The workers demanded counter-defense before they were disorganized and disarmed. The Party leadership continued to serve as a brake. On Sunday, February 11th, the very popular factory chairman, Stockhammer, was arrested in Vienna. Monday morning the Florisdorf workers demanded a protest strike against his arrest. Saturday night the vice-mayor of Wiener-Neustadt was also arrested. The workers immediately responded with strikes and demonstrations.

Events began to move like an avalanche because of the happenings in Linz, Monday morning, February 12th. The police and the Heimwehr attacked the Party headquarters in Linz and demanded the weapons. When the Schutzbund refused to surrender them, the Heimwehr and the police started firing. The fight ensued, with many dead as a result.

The news came to Vienna at about ten o'clock and, to be sure, not through the official Party but through the Opposition. The latter informed the workers of the electric factories in Vienna and demanded a struggle of solidarity. The electric workers began a spontaneous struggle and then turned to the Party leadership. The latter decided by one vote for the general strike and the mobilization of the Schutzbund after the workers had already struck by themselves.

The general strike was unsuccessful. The determining factor was that the railroad workers did notparticipate. They had previously been

forced by Dolfuss to enter the "Patriotic Front" against which the Socialist Party of Austria and the trade unions did not organize any resistance The majority of the trade union leaders did not take the general strike seriously, since it had been announced so many times without being taken in earnest.

According to the reporter of the "Manchester Guardian" not more than 6,000 active fighters participated in the armed uprising with an additional 3,000 aiding them. The government, on the other hand, had about 9,000 policemen, 800 detectives, about 8,000 to aid the police, 4,000 with guns, gas bombs, machine guns and artillery, i.e. four times as many.

The struggle was led by the leader and organizer of the Schutzbund, Julius Deutsch. The military plan which was executed was as follows: to occupy and staunchly defend the working class actions and to leave the center of the city to its own fate -- a purely defensive plan.

This military plan corresponds completely to the fundamental political line of the Austrian Social Democracy which was orientated towards the defense of bourgeois democracy, which had long ago been destroyed. Monday night the Socialist Party of Austria distributed a circular, upon being provoked by Fey, which said: "Mr. Fey, who has so brutally provoked, the working class dares to speak of a criminal conspiracy of bolshevist-Marxist elements. The truth is that Social Democracy touches neithr citizens nor peasants. It is prepared to fight in case the Fascists should dare to destroy the constitution of the republic". This corresponds 100% to the Linz Program of the Austrian Social Democracy: "Application of force only for the defense of the bourgeois-democratic constitution and after its violation."

The class consequence, political and military, corresponded according to a report which was published by the French social-democratic paper "Populaire" from the circles of the Austrian Social Democracy. "Certain trade unions did not carry out the general strike. The majority of the population did not aid those fighting, although it was sympathetic. Only a minority of the working class, a section of the Schutzbund fought but not the masses of workers."

This minority, as a result of the policy of the Austrian Social Democracy, was isolated from the mass of petty bourgeoisie and the small peasants, held out four days against the tremendously powerful enemy, fought with leonine courage, with embitterment and tenacity, though the great mass of the working class remained passive . Proletarian women fought in the ranks, charging machine guns. Outside of Vienna and Linz, Styria witnessed

heavy fights as well as Worl and the Tyrol.

After the struggle, the victors avenged themselves in a barbaric fashion. The Social Democracy, the free trade unions and all other independent working class organizations were dissolved and destroyed. The workers' sections of Vienna, where most of he fighting was done, were greatly damanged, partly destroyed.

11 Self-Indictment by the Social Democracy of Austria.

The best proof exposing the role of the Austrian Social Democracy before and during the uprising in their own representation which was published in the "Freiheit" (Saarbruecken)) under the title "Revolution and Counter-Revolution", a first report by a leader of the Austrian Social Democracy. The most important paragraphs are herewith quoted literally:

After recounting the acts of the government on March 7th, it says: "For eleven months...(the Austrian Social Democracy) practiced the greatest restraint. It did not "respond with violent actions to the acts of violence of the government. On the contrary, it again and again until very, very recently made all efforts in order to reach a peaceful agreement and form a united front against the National-Socialists to negotiate with the Dollfuss government and the non-fascist wing of the Christian Socialists." And what was the result? This "peaceful conduct" led "only to more and more hostile measures against the working class and the Social Democracy. All attempts to have negotiations for an agreement Dollfuss rejected in the most haughty and insulting manner. The ever-sharpening measures of the government resulted in: "The wrath of the workers was directed more and more against the tolerant policy of the Party leadership. More and more members demanded a struggle. In the Fall, the resolution on the general strike was passed with the four already mentioned conditions. "The Party leadership for months experienced difficulty in explaining the necessity for this tolerant policy to the workers."

After the actions of the Heimwehr in the Tyrol, after the arrests of the Schutzbund leaders, and after the confiscation of the weapons, they said: "These incidents must have created the impression among the workers that the Heimwehr, while carrying through a putsch against democracy, at the same time tried to disarm the workers and to disorganize the Schutzbund through the arrests of the local leaders." The workers said: "As the situation is now, we must not let them disorganize us through arrests of the Schutzbund leaders and through the confiscation of arms if we don't want to face within a few days a Fascist coup d etat, defenceless, and incapable of fighting". And the Party leadership? "Nevertheless, the Party leadership pursued its line rigidly". That is, they continued to wait, this time for the result of the negotiations between Chancellor Dollfuss

and the Provincial key men on the demands of the Heimwehr. ...."But the militancy of the masses had reached such a point where the warnings of the Party leadership could no longer have any effect." After Linz: "The Viennese workers had the feeling that they must not abandon the Linz comrades, that they must not let them fight alone." ..."And thus events ran their course" Against the will of the Party leadership which was finally disregarded by pressure from below and which still regrets it after the events. "If the Party leadership would have succeeded in finly adhering to its line until the very last moment, then, in all likelihood the fight could not have been prevented either...but the struggle would probably have been better understood by the broad masses of the people if it would have first started after the open fascist coup d'etat." (In reality, the struggle would have been impossible after the complete disorganization and disarmament of the Schutzbund)

This self-indictment is underscored by the testimony of the other Social-Democratic parties.

In the protest of the Social Democratic party of Czechoslovakia to Dollfuss against the execution of the arrested workers it says: "It was you who distrubed peace and violated the law, Mr. Chancellor, and not the workers. They fight for democratic constitution and for legality."

Leon Blum, the leader of the French Social Democracy, in an editorial of the paper "Populaire" says: "The truth is that the Social Democracy, fearful of the dangers which threatened Austria and fearful of the consequences in Europe which a civil war would have, bore all persecutions, which Dolfuss systematically brought down upon them, with Stoic patience. The truth is that they let their own power of resistance crumble through this slow decay. The truth is that it directly and indirectly multiplied the proposals for reconciliaton and agreement for a common struggle against the Nazi danger."

111 The Communist Party of Austria

The Communist Party of Austria had been declared illegal previously and was working underground. It was very weak and unable to utilize the growing opposition within the Social Democratic workers in favor of a considerable strengthening of communism. With correct tactics even a few thousand communists could have exerted tremendous influence. This was not the case. The Communist Party of Austria, however, worked for the strengthening of the workers' will to struggle. Their members stood in the ranks of the fighting comrades. But thy were too weak in order to lead the fight even locally, not to speak of the creation of a central leadership.

IV How International Reformism Misused the Austrian Struggles

Let us refer to important paragraphs from the call of the SecondInternational of February 15th:

"Just as the Paris Commune has for decades pointed out the way for the international proletariat, so from now on, Red Vienna will be the signal for future struggles, a warning to international fascism."

"The struggle of Austria signifies to the world: Democracy is not sacrificed in vain. The proletariat cannot be defeated without a struggle."

"In years to come the toiling masses will ask how can socialism build a new world. We shall point with pride to that which the Austrian socialists created in fifteen years of socialist construction."

In other words, the Second International tries to justify Austro-Marxism by pointing to the fact that the Social Democratic workers of Austria, disregarding their leaders, fought at the last moment. They try to justify the Austro-Marxism which led them to a point where they had to fight with already broken forces, isolated from the great mass of the people.

The "Prague Vorwaerts" talks in the same vein.

"You must defend your freedom, your right of self-determination, your right to live, if must be with arms-- that is the lesson drawn from the events in Vienna."

The tendency in general is to save the honor of the Second International and reformism by pointing to the struggle of the Austrian workers, although according to the reports of the Austrian Social Democrats and the Socialist press it is quite clear that the heroic struggle goes to the credit of the workers who finally, disgusted with the policies of their leaders, fought and that the policy of Austro-Marxism led to an attempt to avoid the armed struggle, to the weakening and isolation of the workers, to a lack of a central and united revolutionary leadership in the struggle.

V. Lessons of the Struggle in Austria

1) The fact that the Austrian workers who fought heroically, under the most unfavorable conditions, due to the reformist-centrist policies, could withstand for four days a military power which was four times as strong cannot but encourage revolutionary workers. It shows what tremendous force is theirs if they follow a revolutionary instead of a reformist leadership.

2) Under the reformist leadership the Austrian workers avoided the struggle for a whole year. They fought under the slogan of defending bourgeois democracy which had already been smashed, i.e. they were on the defensive instead of on the offensive.

The results were:

a) Due to the passive acceptance of the acts of violence by the government, a large section of the workers had become discouraged and passive. Only a minority fought. The general strike was not effective.

b) The working class was isolated from the urban petty bourgeoisie and the mall peasants, who can be united with the working class against the capitalists, landowners, and large peasants, against capitalism and the bourgeois state only through real revolutionary objectives.

c) Due to this the working class was unable to penetrate the army and the police.

d) When the working class finally took up the struggle, its organizations had already been partly destroyed (arrests of leaders of the Schutzbund, etc.) The workers were thus compelled to fight in isolated separate groups and consequently the enemy could overpower them more easily.

e) The defensive reformist line led to a defensive military strategy, to the concentration in the working class districts, while the workers could only be victorious if they had attacked the center of the city, the buildings which house the government.

The general strike and theuprising failed because they can only succeed if they form the final moments of a number of constantly sharpening partial struggles directed and developed from thedefensive to the offensive. The general strike and uprising failed because of the reformist objective and the reformist policy of avoiding partial struggles, the constant attempt tocompromise with the enemy, the trusts displayed in the aid of imperialist powers, i.e. in an alliance with the imperialist bourgeoisie of other countries.

3) The Austrian working class was really not split. Revolutionary, centrist, openly reform elements, all were united in one party. Thus a united revolutionary leadership could not exist The Alliance of the revolutionary elements with the centrist and openly reformist elements assured the defeat. The task of the Austrian comrades today is to create a united revolutionary i.e. a communist party as its leader, and completely and mercilessly to liquidate centrism and open reformism.

4) The struggle of the Austrian Social Democratic workers underscores the crime of the German Social Democracy which capitulated without a struggle, although it controlled the Prussian police (July, 1932) and (Jan. 1933) although General Schleicher pledged the aid of the Reichswehr. The German Socialist Party capitulated without any struggle because of fear that it might be followed by communism as soon as it entered a mass struggle.

5)In connection with the Austrian struggle the question naturally comes up again in Germany; Should the Communist Party of Germany not have taken up arms in January,30,1933, though a minority. We again say no. The Communist Party of Germany faced the majority of the organized working class which was kept back from action by the Socialist Party of Germany and the trade unions. (July 20, 1932 and January 30,1933) For a minority to fight without the support and even against the majority of the organized working class is putschism. Our comrades must by no means become confused on this issue. The situation in Austria was different. In Austria the workers fought a battle of despair; one section of the workers had already been made passive but they were not faced by an organized section of the working class in opposition.

The mistake of the Communist Party of Germany was not that it did not take up the fight as a minority in July,1932, but that, as a result of its ultra-left tactics, it did not check the influence of reformism in time and adequately in order to wrest the leadership of the majority of the workers from the Socialist Party.

VI The Comintern and the Struggles in Austria.

1. The Comintern is responsible for the fact that in Austria,the Communist Party, despite favorable conditions, remained a small, and influential group.

2. The fundamentally correct in its analysis of the Austrian struggles, the Comintern made erroneous statements which make it more difficult for Social Democratic workers to draw the correct communist lessons, for example "Humanite" of Paris, February 14th,1934, wrote on Austria:

"Today the Social Democratic Party is dissolved and Herr Bauer escaped or is hiding in order to offer his assistance and put his 'experience' at the disposal of Dollfuss and Prince Starhemberg."

Or the "Pravda" of February 14th,1934:

"At this moment the Sodal Democratic leaders yielded just as disgracefully as Braun, Wels, Severing in Germany, without any resistance, at thefirst demand of the Fascist authorities."

This is true of one section of the Social Democratic leaders but not of another which fought alongside of the workers.

In 1919 in Germany and in 1920 in the Kapp Putsch the Independent Socialist Party leaders also fought, as is well known. If one falsifies these facts one merely weakens the effect of the necessary communist critique of the policy of these leaders who,after all, fought with the struggling workers. Here it is not the question ofthe personal courage of centrist leaders, but rather thequestion of

centrist policies and their consequences. The fact that, for example, Ledebour and others in 1919 and 1920 fought in the ranks of the revolutionary workers did not hinder us from criticising mercilessly and most sharply their policy which is somewhere between opportunistic compromises and putschism and led to defeats. But this critique can be effective only if it is based on true facts.

VII. The Domestic and Foreign Consequences

1) In Austria itself Dollfuss is now completely in the hands of the Heimwehr. The Christian Socialist Party, on whose right wing Dollfuss bases his support is destroyed along with the Social Democracy and the free trade unions.

2) But the Heimwehr, although a tool of Italian fascism, working with Italian funds and obeying their orders, is not a broad fascist mass party. It is a reactionary section of big landowners, wealthy peasants, capitalists, generals, priests with a small following and monarchist forces.

3) The typical fascist mass organization is represented by the Nazis. Due to their demagogy they now have a following from the less class-conscious and disillusioned sections of the working class. The Nazis in Austria under the leadership of the Nazis in Hitler Germany are now trying to spread disintegration in the Heimwehr and to force them to compromise, to divide the power which will finally be given to the Nazis completely. (Habicht's Proclamation).

4) This perspective has sharpened the antagonisms between Hitler Germany and Fascist Italy. Italy is trying to unite under its leadership Austria and Hungary. This block is not directed only against Hitler Germany but also against the Little Entente (Czech-Slovakia, Yougoslavia, Roumania). France, within certain bounds, aids Italy against Hitler Germany but tries at the same time to curb the bloc of Austria-Hungary*Italy. England has declared, platonically, for the "independence and integrity of Austria", but has at the same time rejected any pledge to interfere.

General result: Sharpening of the international contradictions in Central Europe; sharpening of the war danger. Temporary compromises between the chief participants are possible; they do not signify a solution of the contradictions; at best a postponement of open conflict for the purpose of improving the political, economic and military conditions of the participating great powers.

The continuous avoidance by the Socialist Party of Austria of the "civil war" has, therefore, not eliminated the war danger but hastened it and

and sharpened it. The victory of the working class in Austria which was very possible, had there been a correct revolutionary leadership, would have had such widespread effects on the working classes of the surrounding countries that an imperialist attack would have been made very difficult. Also, a victorious proletarian Austria with the help of the Soviet Union would have had the possibility of maintaining itself economically.(Export of industrial products to the Soviet Union, import of food from the Soviet Union, etc.)

VIII TASKS

1) To make clear, above all to the Social Democratic workers the lessons to be drawn from these vents. The Austrian Social Democracy was a practical model of centrist policies.

2) The necessity of spurring on torevolutionary struggle.

3) International solidarity meetings for the Austrianworking class; mass protests against the regime of Dollfuss and Starhemberg.

4)In Germany prticularly: Exposing Nazi demagogy to the Austrian workers by pointing to their deeds in Germany. Against the interferences of Hitler Germany in Austria as the source of sharpened imperialist war danger. Against the enslavement of Austrian workers through the Nazis.

THE FIRST UNDERGROUND NATIONAL CONVENTION of The Communist Party of Germany(Opposition)

To The Communist Party of the United States(Opposition):-

Dear Comrades:

The first conference of the Communist Party of Germany(Opposition) has taken place, being held under the most severe underground conditions. In spite of the insufficient means at our disposal, the coming and return of the delegates occurred without any losses. The most responsible functionaries of our organization in all districts of Germany came together at the conference. In a fruitful session lasting five days, for the first time in fifteen months, thoroughly discussed and critically examined the experiences of illegal work.

To do this was a pressing necessity, for in Hitler Germany it has to-date been impossible to get the responsible comrades, numbering twenty-two, together for five days. We took a position on the most important political and organizational problems confronting us in Germany. The carrying out of the conference is an example of inner-party democracy and of the strictest communist discipline. Every one of us returned to our fighting posts strengthened by the critical discussion.

Among other things, we took a position on international questions and on the problem of developing the International Relief Association. We approved unanimously the position of our National Bureau on the problems discussed. The developments in Sweden, Czecho-Slovakia and Austria prove that we are on the right road. Among the most cheering reports we consider the splendid acts of solidarity of the American Communist Party (Opposition).

Comrades of the American Communist Party(Opposition)! You have greatly helped our work with your material aid. Our conference sends you the heartiest greetings of struggle and thanks you for your fraternal solidarity which we accept as the expression of the closest Communist unity.

We can declare with pride that the CP(O) has held its own against the crusade of destruction by the Brown bandits and that our organization has remained intact in spite of heavy sacrifices. In town and country we have won in spite of our illegality new and determined fighters from the ranks of the CPG and the Social-Democracy. Our political influence has grown. We believe that this will not be without effect on the international Communist movement. Under the barrage of the Fascist counter-revolution the forces of the proletarian revolution will gather and we will succeed in creating unity in the Communist movement on the basis of Leninist tactics and Communist principles.

In the fourteen months of illegality we have learned much and we believe that the time is now approaching when we can pass over from propaganda to agitation among the broad masses and to the preparation of mass actions. We direct our work particularly toward the development of resistance in the factories and among the unemployed. Our pioneer work in the creation of independent class trade union achieves great significance in this respect.

Every meeting of our groups of five, every step in preparing and distributing illegal literature, places the greatest demand on every individual. Arrests, jail, imprisonment, concentration camps and bloody terror threaten every revolutionary fighter, today far more than ever. The legal crusade of persecution by the secret state police has now replaced the crude Fascist mass terror. Since the beginning of the Hitler dictatorship five hundred comrades of the CP(O) have been sent to jail and to the concentration camps. In the last quarter of a year alone, in four out of our twenty districts, thirty-two comrades have been sentenced to thirty-seven years imprisonment. Most of the imprisoned were jailed without any trial and were subjected to the most awful mistreatment and torture. The IRA, also working illegally, does its best to help us but it is only a drop in the bucket; for the number of victims is too great. Of greater significance, therefore, is the help of the international sections of the IRA, especially the American. Please transmit in the most appropriate way to the American IRA and those who support it the thanks and the greetings of the victims of the Brown terror.

We have noted with the greatest fraternal interest your successes on the political and trade union field. It gives us added strength in our strenuous task to see that the American CP (O) has utilized with success the experience and lessons of German events for the winning of masses to Communism and the trade unions for revolutionary mass struggle, for the formation of proletarian united fronts and for the defense against all reactionary attacks.

Comrades! We ask you to transmit our thanks to the American workers and all members of the mass organizations under your influence for the material support and their ardent revolutionary greetings. We greet especially the membership of Local 22 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union in New York, who by their votes for the union leadership made a shining recognition for a correct revolutionary trade union policy. We greet the Pennsylvania miners who are beginning to place their confidence in the policies of the CP (O). Our best regards also to the workers and comrades in struggle in Chicago and Montreal, who have tied-up their campaign against the Brown press of the Hitler dictatorship with the fight against the mercenaries of the Fascist dictatorship. We greet especially the Lithuanian Communist group, the news of whose fraternal affiliation with the ICO was transmitted to us at the conference.

We are in the forefront of the struggle against the Hitler dictatorship. The evidences of your solidarity show us that our fight is receiving international approval. Your material and moral support aids us and strengthens us in our difficult task.

Hail the fight for Communism and the proletarian dictatorship!
Down with the hangmen of the Fascist dictatorship!
Uncompromising struggle against reformism and centrism!
Fight for the organization of the proletarian united front and the winning of mass organizations for the revolutionary struggle against the establishment of the Fascist dictatorship in the non-fascist countries!
Fight against the false tactics and the ultra-left course of the Comintern and the CP!
For the unity of the Communist movement in all countries!

Delegates to the National Conference
of
The Communist Party of Germany (Opposition)

Denmark, Middle of April, 1934

Publications Of The

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST OPPOSITION

DIE NEUE WELT - Organ der Kommunistischen Partei (Opposition) Elsass - Redaktion: Strassburg, Steinwallstr. 56 (Daily)

INFORMATION - Organ Communist Party Sweden (Opposition) : Nytorgsgatan 15, 2 Stockholm, Sweden.

ARBEITER-ZEITUNG - Tageszeitung und Organ der Kommunistischen Partei (Opposition) der Schweiz Redaktion: Schaffhausen, Webergasse 39.

THE CANADIAN TOILER - Monthly Bulletin of The Workers' League of Canada: The Canadian Toiler Box 24, Postal Station "A", Toronto, Ontario.

NACHRICHTENDIENST der Internationalen Vereinigung der Kommunistischen Opposition: available thru any of the above agencies.

GEGEN DEN STROM - Central theoretical organ Communist Party of Germany (Opposition) UNDERGROUND. available thru any of the above agencies.

WORKERS AGE (bi-weekly) official organ Communist Party U.S.A. (Opposition), 51 West 14 Street, New York, N. Y.

For subscription rates write to:

COMMUNIST PARTY U.S.A. (OPPOSITION)
51 West 14th Street
New York, N. Y.